

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 5 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 447, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117-3) on the resolution (H. Res. 85) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the "National Apprenticeship Act") and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 447, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 85 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 85

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the "National Apprenticeship Act") and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without inter-

vening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

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

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

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

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except three hours of debate, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour, on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by Representative Beyer of Virginia and Representative Schweikert of Arizona or their respective designees.

SEC. 6. Rule XXVIII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the House of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 73 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 8. (a) Clause 3(g)(3)(C) of rule II is amended to read as follows:

"(C) Upon receipt of an appeal pursuant to subdivision (B), the Committee on Ethics shall have a period of 30 calendar days or five legislative days, whichever is later, to con-

sider the appeal. The fine will be upheld unless the appeal is agreed to by a majority of the Committee. Upon a determination regarding the appeal or if no appeal has been filed at the expiration of the period specified in subdivision (B), the chair of the Committee on Ethics shall promptly notify the Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner, the Speaker, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer, and shall make such notification publicly available. The Speaker shall promptly lay such notification before the House."

(b) Section 4(a)(2) of House Resolution 38 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) a fine imposed pursuant to this section shall be treated as though imposed under clause 3(g) of rule II, and shall be administered as though pursuant to clause 4(d) of rule II, except that if a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner files an appeal under clause 3(g)(3)(B) of rule II prior to the date on which the Committee on Ethics has adopted written rules, the period for the Committee's consideration of the appeal under clause 3(g)(3)(C) of rule II shall begin on the date on which the chair of the Committee notifies the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner that the Committee has adopted such rules."

SEC. 9. Section 5 of House Resolution 8, agreed to January 4, 2021 (as amended by House Resolution 41, agreed to January 13, 2021), is amended by striking "February 11" each place that it appears and inserting "March 12".

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 85, providing for consideration of H.R. 447, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairman SCOTT, makes in order 26 amendments, provides en bloc authority to Chairman SCOTT, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 11 under a closed rule. It self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairman YARMUTH. It also provides 3 hours of debate with 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by Representatives BEYER of Virginia and SCHWEIKERT of Arizona, or their respective designees.

The rule also provides that H. Res. 73 is hereby adopted. The rule updates the process by which Members can appeal fines for refusing to wear a mask or for taking photographs or recording audio or video on the House floor to align with the Ethics Committee appeal procedures established in H. Res. 73.

Finally, the rule extends standard district work period instructions, same day, and suspension authority through March 12, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, the National Apprenticeship Act is critical workforce development legislation that will invest \$3.5 billion to create nearly 1 million new apprenticeship opportunities over the next 5 years. This is a history investment in workforce training, and I am so pleased to support this effort.

Skilled workers are the backbone of our economy. And apprenticeships provide a unique opportunity to grow and expand access to this workforce.

Not only do apprenticeship programs provide pathways to meaningful and sustainable careers, they are critical to expanding our Nation's skilled workforce. When I meet with local businesses in my district in Rochester, New York, I regularly hear that their greatest challenge is finding skilled labor to fill positions and keep their businesses thriving.

Apprenticeships provide an invaluable pathway to engage workers, establish connections with high-demand industries, and set workers on a path to a rewarding and sustainable career.

I note that as the son of an individual who dropped out of high school at the age of 16, my dad, after service in Korea in the United States Army, came home and got involved in an apprenticeship for the Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 13 Union and had a long, long career where he retired at the age of 70 after having supported a family of seven. What was directly responsible for that was the apprenticeship program and his ability to build that sustained career.

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

Now, more than ever, these programs are critical to grapple with the long-term economic impacts of COVID-19.

This week we will also begin the next phase of addressing the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic through H. Con. Res. 11, a budget resolution for fiscal year 2021. Passing this budget resolution is a necessary step to fast-track essential COVID relief, the American Rescue Plan.

This plan will deliver the direct support the American public needs, including a national vaccination program, direct aid to individuals and families,

housing and nutrition assistance, and expansion and extension of unemployment insurance, small business assistance, and resources to protect first responders and frontline workers.

Our Nation has endured an unprecedented health and economic crisis which has now claimed the lives of nearly half a million Americans. After 11 months, far too many Americans are still barely scraping by or falling further behind, through no fault of their own, as they lose jobs or see smaller paychecks. We need immediate, bold action to change the course of the virus and stabilize our economy.

Beginning the budget reconciliation process does not preclude a strong bipartisan agreement on a relief package that can gain wide support in both the House and the Senate. Let me repeat that. It does not preclude a strong, bipartisan agreement on a relief package that can gain wide support in our House and across the building in the Senate. But it does ensure that Congress will be able to move forward without becoming delayed by partisan gridlock at a time when so many lives and livelihoods are at stake.

The budget resolution before us provides a framework for reconciliation with a target of up to \$1.9 trillion, allocated across 12 congressional committees. The resolution instructs these committees to report legislation consistent with their targets to the Budget Committee by February 16. The Budget Committee will then combine the legislation—without substantive revision—and prepare it for floor consideration.

The 2021 budget resolution is not a comprehensive blueprint for the next 10 years. It is designed solely to respond to the ongoing crisis and to deliver critical relief as quickly as possible.

Once we have finished the work of passing a complete COVID response package, I look forward to continuing our work on the Budget Committee to craft a complete forward-looking budget resolution for fiscal year 2022.

□ 1715

We have already lost so much time. Passing this resolution ensures that relief can get to Americans in need, who cannot wait another minute for help.

Mr. Speaker, I would also take a moment to recognize that, less than 1 month ago, this Chamber was besieged by antidemocracy extremists who intended to harm this institution and even kill some of our colleagues.

The rule provides penalties for any Member of the House who endangers colleagues by violating the rules of this Chamber. Members are not, under any circumstances, permitted to bring firearms on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. That has been in law and regulation since 1967.

As President Ronald Reagan said: "Trust, but verify."

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, there should be no problem with requiring Members to walk through

metal detectors into the Chamber, ensuring that everyone is following the same rules, ensuring the safety of each and every Member of this body, and ensuring that many members of our staff who work here day in and day out are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and H. Con. Res. 11 and the National Apprenticeship Act.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of two pieces of legislation. The first, H.R. 447, is the National Apprenticeship Act. The bill seeks to improve and streamline access to apprenticeships. These goals are broadly supported by Members on both sides of the political aisle, in the House and in the Senate.

We considered an almost identical bill in the 116th Congress, which was the previous Congress. At that time, Republicans expressed a desire to work together to achieve the goal of modernizing the National Apprenticeship Program. Since then, the Democrats have pushed through their bill that did nothing to streamline the program, nothing for flexibility for employer-driven apprenticeships.

The bill before us today is largely the same. Rather than work with Republicans in a meaningful way, the majority remains committed to codifying decades of rigid regulations and red tape. The Committee on Education and Labor did not even have a hearing or a markup on this bill before it came before the Committee on Rules, essentially shutting out committee Republicans from the negotiation process entirely—many of whom were new members on the Committee on Education and Labor and did not participate in the discussion in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, between 2009 and 2019, America saw a 128 percent growth in apprenticeships. In September of 2020, the Department of Labor reported that 94 percent of all apprentices who completed their apprenticeship received an average annual salary of \$70,000. Today's registered apprenticeship system is an important tool for job seekers and employers.

It does have some flaws, however. In 2019, 252,000 individuals began an apprenticeship. Good for them, but only 81,000 graduated.

This bill would make the apprenticeship system the only registered and Department of Labor-supported apprenticeship option, shutting the door on opportunities for those who participate in nonregistered earn-and-learn programs. While so many in the Nation have lost work due to the economic toll of the pandemic, now is not the time to make it harder to find adequate training by reducing an individual's apprenticeship options.

Mr. Speaker, the National Apprenticeship Act would make this system even less receptive to innovation and create prescriptive requirements on apprenticeships. It also makes it difficult for small and medium-sized businesses to participate, as they do not always have the resources to navigate the lengthy and Byzantine Department of Labor registration process.

America desperately needs more lab technicians. We need more medical assistants. We need more pharmacy technicians. In the middle of a global public health crisis, we cannot afford to stymie motivated future employees.

Republicans agree that this 80-year-old system can and must be improved, but the solutions must be targeted and effective. The majority claims that the increased funding in this legislation will create 1 million apprenticeships. While it is true that the legislation provides significantly more funding, unfortunately, more money alone doesn't guarantee better outcomes if the underlying systems don't work in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of this rule provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 11, establishing a budget for fiscal year 2021, and providing the budget reconciliation instructions for fiscal years 2021 through 2030. Budget reconciliation is a fast-track, budgetary tool used to implement policy changes into law. This procedure requires only 51 votes in the Senate—not the normal 60 votes to break the filibuster, but only 51 votes in the Senate—which, unfortunately, can turn this into a partisan exercise, which is what happened here today.

President Biden has proposed a \$1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package, but under the reconciliation instructions included in the resolution, the deficit would increase to between \$2 trillion and \$3 trillion.

Look, on the west front of the Capitol 2 weeks ago, the President called for unity—his first move. And, today, we see the Democrats employing a partisan process to jam through their wish list of policy priorities.

The Budget Committee has not yet even organized as a committee, but the Committee on Rules adopted a rule to consider budget reconciliation without any prior hearings or markups. This will be the first time since 1974 that Congress has bypassed the Budget Committee and gone straight to the floor with a budget resolution.

In addition, the Democrats did not pass a budget resolution at all for fiscal year 2021. So the budget resolution before us today is exactly 290 days late.

Barely 1 month ago, Congress passed—and President Trump signed into law—a \$900 billion coronavirus relief package. Combined with previous relief packages—and there were many—there remains \$1 trillion in unspent funding. To my knowledge, there have been very few, if any, authorizing and oversight hearings to account for what funds are needed and

how these funds have been spent and ensure they are being used in a way that best benefits the American people.

With all of that as background, then you have to ask yourself: “Why is it now so urgent to pass another \$2 trillion bill?”

Well, the answer lies in the progressive, partisan policy priorities that the majority wants to push through, including raising taxes, increasing the minimum wage, implementing the Green New Deal, providing a path to citizenship for illegal aliens, lowering Medicare eligibility, providing universal basic income, and canceling student loan debt.

But these policies do not address the immediate needs of Americans who are trying to survive the pandemic. Now is not the time to push partisan priorities.

Look, Republicans do stand ready to work with Democrats to provide the needed resources for the American people. Yesterday's visit by 10 Republican senators to the Oval Office and the time that President Biden spent with them certainly should be indicative to people that there is a willingness to work together to solve the problems of the country, but we also are obligated to ensure that the proposals are thoroughly vetted and will be implemented in a way that actually helps rather than further harms our recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I would add that Mr. MORELLE referenced some of the other things contained in the rule. I think it is important that Members understand the threats under which we operate. As such, I, frankly, do not understand why we have not been provided a classified briefing by the Speaker of the House as to what the threats were prior to January 6 and what the threats are going forward. Suffice it to say, that the people's House—the House of Representatives—now is completely on lockdown. There are no people in the people's House other than the Representatives, and that is not the way it was intended.

I think we are owed an explanation for what the level of threat is so that we may adequately prepare ourselves in our personal lives, as well as our work in our districts. I would call upon the Speaker to make such a bipartisan Member briefing available as soon as possible.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to say to the distinguished gentleman, my friend: These are not partisan priorities; these are American priorities.

I doubt very much that most Americans care about the process we use as they struggle to feed their families or as they struggle to pay their rent each month, when they face unemployment that could be extended. But here is an opportunity for us to work together. This is the beginning of the process, and we will continue to encourage bi-

partisan discussion on a budget resolution that provides meaningful relief for millions of Americans affected by this virus.

As it relates to the National Apprenticeship Act, I would also suggest that this is a bipartisan bill. I can name the Members of my colleagues across the aisle: Mr. FITZPATRICK; Mr. MCKINLEY; Members Bacon and Bost; my friend, RODNEY DAVIS, from Illinois; JOHN KATKO, whose district abuts mine; ANDY GARBARINO, my friend from New York; Representatives STAUBER, KINZINGER, STIVERS—all Republicans who support and sponsor the National Apprenticeship Act. So this is a bipartisan bill, and I will continue to advocate for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying measures before us today, but I take a moment to discuss something else included here.

Mr. Speaker, just outside these doors is something students walk through every day to prevent gun violence in their schools, something travelers pass through every time they board an airplane, and something the public goes through every time they enter a Federal building:

Magnetometers. Metal detectors.

They are a modern-day inconvenience that we are all used to, and, frankly, they are a small price to pay to keep Americans safe.

Metal detectors were installed outside this Chamber following the recent deadly insurrection at the Capitol. Although these machines are new, the policy they are enforcing is not. That has been on the books for more than 50 years.

President Lyndon Johnson signed a law outlawing weapons on Capitol grounds back in 1967. The Capitol Police Board, the entity that oversees security regulations in the complex, then issued regulations soon after. They prohibited firearms from being carried into the Chamber and in the connected rooms and galleries.

Mr. Speaker, now some Members, like myself, want to see these regulations go further. Representatives HUFFMAN and SPEIER have been instrumental on this front, and I hope that we act. Others want no prohibitions at all.

Mr. Speaker, regardless, the rules are the rules. I thought that was clear, but apparently some of my friends on the other side think differently. Some are acting as though, by being elected to Congress, they have been anointed to some sort of special club, one that gets to pick and choose what rules to follow.

A Member on the other side ran an ad depicting her walking around our Nation's Capital with a loaded firearm,

tweeting: "Let me tell you why I will carry my Glock to Congress."

Another Republican recently bragged that he was armed during the recent riots, and another was stopped by Capitol Police bringing a gun into this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. We have people in this Chamber who have posted disturbing and threatening rhetoric against Members of this body. And there is speculation that maybe some Members were complicit with those who attacked the Capitol on January 6. You know, these words and actions raise serious safety concerns.

Mr. Speaker, these metal detectors are manned by the same police officers who saved our lives during the insurrection while risking their own, yet some Members on the other side have disrespected these Capitol Police Officers, verbally abused them, pushed them aside, and disregarded their orders, all to avoid this basic safety measure. That is no way to treat our heroes.

Some of these very same Members have been quick to send press releases and cut advertisements about the need to respect the police; but here in these Halls, when they think no one is watching, apparently their message is different. It is: "Do as I say, not as I do."

Mr. Speaker, that is why we must act today. This isn't a messaging bill. This is as serious as it gets. This elitist mentality must end.

□ 1730

Apparently, it will take a rules change to ensure that all Members follow the rules just like everyone else.

Included in this measure is language to change the rules to fine Members who interfere with the Capitol Police's ability to do their jobs at the magnetometers outside this Chamber: \$5,000 for the first offense, \$10,000 for each one thereafter.

This is modeled after a change my Republican friends made in the 115th Congress, which fined Members for taking photos or videos on the floor.

We are taking steps to make sure this process is transparent and fair. Violations will be posted online, and Members will have the chance to have their appeal considered by the bipartisan Ethics Committee.

And let me assure all Americans that these fines will be paid directly by Members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a mind reader, but I have been here long enough to know how this debate will go. Some on the other side will act like this is some grand inconvenience. Tell that to the millions of Americans who go through metal detectors every day in this country.

Why are you any different? Give me a break.

We need to protect not just Members but staff and all the people who work up here. We need to protect our constituents and the public who visit the people's House.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support this change. The rules apply to us, too, and it is time all of us acted like it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the distinguished Member from Texas, for yielding.

Today's rule sets in motion a process for considering H. Con. Res. 11, a shell budget for fiscal year 2021. I understand that the majority's stated intent in bringing forward this resolution is to pave the way for using budget reconciliation to push through a partisan COVID-19 relief package. Unfortunately, I think the majority's intent is misguided.

I want to remind us all that the only reason we are here today is that the majority failed to pass a budget last year. As of today, we are nearly 9½ months overdue for the passage of the budget for fiscal year 2021, and fiscal year 2021 is already a third of the way over. Hardly an auspicious start for an item as serious as the annual budget for the United States Government.

But the lack of expeditiousness that characterized the budget in the 116th Congress has been replaced by hastiness. The majority is now, in the 117th Congress, rushing forward with a new budget despite never bothering to convene the Budget Committee. Indeed, the Budget Committee has yet to meet in this Congress, much less conduct normal hearings that pave the way for the markup of the annual budget.

Rather than undertake the normal process through the Budget Committee, the majority is instead air-dropping a budget straight from leadership offices directly onto the floor. This is hardly the kind of process considered to be regular order, and it fails to give Members a chance to have their ideas considered in committee or to offer amendments on the floor.

Indeed, as a longtime member of the Budget Committee myself, I looked forward to our hearings on the budget and the markup. Through this process, Members had the opportunity to consider the budget, consider expert testimony, offer ideas, and propose amendments to be considered by the whole committee. That the majority is failing to do so makes a mockery out of the entire budgeting process.

Over the past year, Congress has shown it can work together to produce bipartisan legislation. In the last Congress, we actually passed five COVID-19 relief bills that appropriated nearly \$4 trillion in relief funds. Not all of these funds have yet been spent. Not even close, Mr. Speaker. And the \$4 trillion number is right around the annual budgetary outlays of the Federal Government in a normal year, covering both mandatory and discretionary spending.

Yet, the majority is moving forward with yet another bill and seems deter-

mined to ensure that this bill enshrines as many partisan policy priorities as possible.

To make matters worse, from looking at the actual budget before us, we do not know what these partisan priorities are. We know the budget includes instructions to committees to increase spending by certain amounts, but it does not offer any guidance on how they should do so.

Will it encompass only COVID relief matters, or will they enact progressive policy goals like Medicare for All or the Green New Deal? We have no way of knowing.

We do know that Senator BERNIE SANDERS, the socialist leader of the Senate Budget Committee, wants to use reconciliation to ram through a \$15 minimum wage, a measure that would be a disaster for workers and businesses alike in my home State of Oklahoma. But what else may be included in the bill is a mystery.

Mr. Speaker, this process hardly benefits the bipartisanship that we were promised by President Biden. It has been less than 2 weeks since the new President was inaugurated, and already we are seeing the majority abandoning any pretense at bipartisanship.

The House majority has failed to even propose a bipartisan COVID relief bill or to engage Republicans in serious negotiations. Instead, they have simply predetermined the outcome and are moving forward with their own partisan bill without even pretending to try to work with those of us on my side of the aisle.

This is hardly what we were promised, Mr. Speaker. It is hardly what the institution was promised. And on a matter as important as the annual budget of the United States, and during a pandemic as deadly and serious as the one we are currently living through, I know the institution can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this course and work together and pass real bipartisan legislation that will benefit all Americans.

Today's rule also adds a change in the House rules, imposing serious fines on Members who fail to go through the new magnetometers around the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, as I told my colleagues on the Rules Committee a short time ago, I don't disagree with the additional security measures to keep Members and staff safe. However, I do have concerns over how the new measures are being implemented.

Earlier this afternoon, I offered an amendment to this rule which would have instructed the House Committee on Administration to review the matter and make appropriate recommendations. I have no issue whatsoever with Members being subjected to the same requirements as staff and our constituents when they enter the Capitol, but I have serious concerns that the majority's proposed solution is untenable.

Requiring Members to pass through a magnetometer each time they enter

the House Chamber, even if they haven't left the area, is a sure recipe for chaos. It is impossible for Members to socially distance when they are stacked up in a line to await their turn at passing through the metal detectors.

When Members need to leave the Chamber to make a phone call right outside the doorway, they have to re-enter and pass through security again. And there are hardworking staff members who work just a few feet away from the House Chamber but must pass through these same magnetometers every time they need to run to their offices and then back to the floor. This is a clear recipe for disorganization and gridlock.

But this need not be the only option, Mr. Speaker. There are already existing metal detectors and X-ray machines at entrances to the building. Why can't Members be screened at those entrances instead? Why must it be right on the way to the very cusp of the Chamber in a location guaranteed to stack up Members outside the door waiting to get in?

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, we have better alternatives, and I urge that we empower the Committee on House Administration to look at that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rejection of the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will admit that there are few people I respect more than my distinguished colleague and friend from the Rules Committee, the ranking member, Mr. COLE.

But I think as it relates to the budget, as I understand it, the Budget Committee chair, Mr. YARMUTH, has continued to extend an invitation to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work together.

And we do want to work together. We want to forge a bipartisan agreement. This today begins a process, however, that can move us toward reconciliation because we understand that the American people are in crisis. America is in crisis.

So while we need to move ahead, and we would like to move ahead with a bipartisan agreement, we cannot sit idly by in the instance that progress is not made.

I think it was President Kennedy in his inauguration, nearly 60 years ago, who said, "Sincerity is always subject to proof." So prove to us your sincerity. Let's work together. And in the interim, we are going to move ahead with this resolution with the support of the Members, and I certainly hope that they will do that.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my new favorite

ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and we are thrilled that he is on the Budget Committee.

The rule puts in motion a process to spend trillions of dollars on a progressive wish list, all under the appearance of pandemic relief. And for what?

We know all five of the last COVID-related pieces of legislation were done on a bipartisan basis. In the last few days, we have seen a framework from 10 Republican Senators laid out to get to a solution.

The fact that we are moving forward with this process just goes to show that yesterday's White House meeting was just a photo-op for the President.

Sadly, the Democrat majority seems to want to go a partisan route in both the House and Senate because they know there is not a bipartisan consensus in this country for the socialist policies they want to include, giveaways to their base, the far left and the coastal elite.

Just look at what is being discussed by Democrats on how they plan to use the budgeting process known as reconciliation, a mechanism traditionally used to control spending and address the debt. They now talk openly about granting mass amnesty; growing the control government has over your healthcare; adding new burdens, rules, and costs on the very small businesses that they have shut down; and bailing out their political allies whose policies destroyed local economies.

All of this they want to somehow hide from the American people with the label of essential items for pandemic relief.

And the rule we are debating right now rewards this process. It is the first step in allowing Washington Democrats to jam this radical agenda through Congress at lightning speed.

I ask the Chair, where was the rush to help American families when the Speaker was holding up support for direct aid to working-class families all spring, all summer, and all fall, eventually dropping her price tag and objections only after the first Tuesday in November? The first Tuesday in November happens to be election day.

I have always kept one motto in my heart as I approach this job: Put people before politics. Unfortunately, what we are seeing from the Democrats is the exact opposite; it is all politics.

In more than 30 years, a budget has not originated in the House that has not first gone through the committee process. This is truly a first. The Budget Committee has yet to even meet, to organize, to set our rules, and to ratify an agenda of oversight of the new administration.

So why are we standing here right now? Why are we moving ahead like this when the President, in his inaugural address, called for unity and spoke about the power of our example? The answer is simple: So that Demo-

crat leaders can spend more on a bunch of programs, ideas, and systems, which they have dreamed about throwing taxpayer money at since they took control of this Chamber 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this. The Democrats talk about unification, the need to unify as a Congress and work together, the need to unify as a country and learn to respect one another again for the good of America. But when their actions don't match their words, the value of every word they say from that point forward becomes meaningless.

The actions of the Democrat majority, to start a process which will only end in more divisive partisanship, is the exact opposite of what our country is asking for right now.

□ 1745

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

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman's point, I appreciate the passion with which the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee makes his argument, but why are we moving ahead, he asked.

Why we are moving ahead today?

The President ran on this very relief agenda and won the popular vote in the United States by more than 8 million votes. We are moving ahead because elections do matter, and the argument that President Biden made is that this country needed swift, significant, and robust relief. That is why we are moving ahead.

Now, I will continue to say—and I am sure my colleagues will continue to say—that the Democrat majority invites bipartisan conversation. We would invite all the Members on the other side to come together in a meaningful way to talk about unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who are out of work, through no fault of their own—millions.

Hundreds of thousands are filing every week for the first time. Millions of Americans don't have enough food on the table. One out of every eight Americans are saying they don't have enough money for food to put on the table.

This is for the millions of Americans who don't have enough money to pay their rent or pay their mortgage, and for the millions of small businesses—or the tens of thousands of small businesses struggling every single week, again, through no fault of their own.

Why are we moving ahead today?

Because there is no more time left on the clock. We need to move ahead in order to provide the substantial relief.

I would also suggest that those who will say that this is too expensive, you only look to find economists all over this country beginning with the head of the Federal Reserve, Jerome Powell, who was appointed by the President to his position, who has consistently said that the worst thing we can do is make too small of an investment. We must

make a robust investment. It is what President Biden talked about repeatedly through this campaign.

There is no hidden agenda here. This is, in fact, the agenda that was talked about repeatedly throughout the campaign. The American public resoundingly responded to the package that the President has now put forward, the package which we would like to take up. We would certainly like to do it with our brothers and sisters on the other side of the aisle, but we are prepared, if not, to respond to the needs of millions of Americans who are in crisis.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), who is a new, freshman member of the Republican Conference, to give what I believe is his first speech on the House floor.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposed rule, which begins laying the framework for one of the largest spending bills in the history of this institution. It is nearly \$2 trillion being dishonestly sold to the people as COVID relief.

With a price tag this big, Mr. Speaker, you would think that the House Democrats would want this bill to go through the committee process where Congress and the public can digest this information. But no. They are attempting to fast-track this bill to make decisions with no committee, no bipartisanship, no oversight, and no discussion.

Mr. Speaker, this is American taxpayers' money, not government's, and it is being spent with no accountability and no transparency.

The bottom line is that the hard-working, taxpaying Americans deserve to have a voice in this process, and I will fight against attempts to fast-track this bloated bill every step of the way.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction in elementary and secondary schools.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON), who is here to explain the amendment.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question, and I do so in support of our students.

Our amendment would ensure that students get back in schools safely and soon. Students have been out of the classroom for far too long, and the costs of at-home learning are far greater than we could have ever imagined, especially when it comes to mental health for our kids.

My bill, the Reopen Schools Act, would prioritize State COVID relief grants for education for schools that are reopening. It would require schools to offer at least partial in-person learning in order to receive these Federal pandemic relief funds. These funds were intended to help students get back into the classroom safely, taking important precautions.

Congress sent States this money so we could reopen schools safely, yet this hasn't happened in so many communities across our country.

I am so proud of our home State of Iowa for already taking a stand for students and requiring schools to offer an in-person learning option. But The Washington Post found that roughly one-third of all K-12 school districts in the United States right now are only offering virtual learning. So this means one-third of our classrooms are closed and one-third of our school playgrounds are still roped off.

The cost of this goes well beyond academics. Child depression, anxiety, and other mental health challenges are surging. The science shows kids need to be back in school.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, even the CDC has confirmed that young kids have an extremely low infection rate right now, a low transmission rate, and a low rate of serious illness from COVID-19. Yet they are forced to stay home and learn from behind a computer screen, that is if these kids have access to computers and broadband internet.

For many students, especially those in rural Iowa, virtual learning is not easy. It is not just going downstairs and logging onto the family computer. It is sitting in the parking lot of the Cedar Rapids Public Library, logging onto the WiFi to finish homework or take a test.

So it is no surprise that our most vulnerable students are the ones who will suffer the most and are suffering the most. Isolation, lack of social support, added stress, and environmental strain of this lockdown have gone on far too long. Kids and families are suffering.

As a mom of two school-age kids, this issue is personal to me. This issue is personal to all parents, and it is personal to all families who care about their kids' well-being. Kids need to be in school. We can get them back behind a desk instead of in front of a screen, and we can do so safely. That is exactly why we allocated funds for this purpose.

It is past time for States and local school districts to stop hoarding these resources and use them for their intended purpose: To pay for science-based safety measures that get students and teachers back in the classroom with less risk.

That is why my bill would condition a portion of the \$54 billion Congress sent to States for K-12 schools in December on reopening their doors. One-third of the education funds provided would be immediately available right now with the remaining two-thirds available to schools in increasing amounts as they move to reopen. Schools with at least 50 percent of students attending in person at least 50 percent of the time would receive the full amount of funding. Parents and students want to return to the classroom. My bill will help make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting our students by defeating the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans agree that apprenticeships are vital to American livelihoods and our national interests. We agree that reforms to these programs are necessary and prudent. It is time to update the apprenticeship program to better reflect the needs of employers and the needs of our Nation. Republicans stand ready to negotiate. Now is the time to give Americans opportunities to succeed, and I sincerely hope that we will do just that.

To recover from this pandemic, we must also not push through policies that do not address the immediate needs of the American people. The budget reconciliation resolution provided for in this rule will drastically increase the deficit and seek to implement nonessential partisan policy priorities without first conducting the necessary authorization hearings and conducting the necessary oversight to ensure that current funding is spent effectively and efficiently.

After the multiple calls for unity, it is disappointing that the first move that we are seeing from the majority in this Congress is to employ this partisan procedural process. I do hope they reconsider and come back to the negotiating table through regular order.

Let me just also ask again that the Speaker allow Members to be briefed by the appropriate law enforcement agencies as to exactly what the threats are here in the Nation's Capital. I think we would all benefit from that not just in our work here in Washington, D.C., but also when we work with constituents and staff back in our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and a "no" vote on the underlying measures.

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

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

Once again, I just say that those Americans who are watching what we do here today and over the next several days, they are going to be asking the question: What are you doing in Washington that will help the average man or woman and child who suffers the ravages of this disease and the economic fallout?

When I talk to people in Rochester, New York—and I am sure when each of us goes back to our home districts—people aren't asking about the nuance of legislative procedures. They are asking about what the government is going to do for them as we face the greatest pandemic in a century and the greatest economic challenge in nearly a century both at the same time. We have so many other challenges as well, but the House of Representatives is going to move forward. This resolution does that. It says that we will certainly encourage bipartisan agreements, bipartisan conversations, and bipartisan action.

The President's conversations with members of the Senate yesterday indicate his willingness to do that. But we cannot wait. We have waited far too long. Too many Americans have died and too many families have faced the crisis of their lifetimes because of the inaction here in Washington. So we must move ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support of the rule before us today. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, on the Budget, and as the Member of Congress for a congressional district that has experienced the worst of COVID-19 as a public health emergency and economic catastrophe, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate on H.R. 447, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2121, and H. Con. Res. 11, 447, as well as the underlying legislation.

The National Apprenticeship Act has the potential to yield \$10.6 billion in net benefits to U.S. taxpayers in the form of increased workers productivity and decreased spending on public-assistance programs and unemployment insurance and which bring America's investments in apprenticeship more in line with countries around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation could not be more timely because during a time of record unemployment, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021 creates an additional 1 million new apprenticeship opportunities and invests more than \$3.5 billion over 5 years in expanding opportunities and access to Registered Apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeships.

I also strongly support H. Con. Res. 11 because it reorders budgetary priorities to provide \$1.9 trillion to allow Congress to take immediate and decisive action to crush the virus and vaccinate our people, build the economy back better, reopen schools, and provide

needed support and assistance to state and local governments that have been asked to do too much with too little for far too long.

Let me make clear at the outset Mr. Speaker, that nothing in this resolution precludes the reaching of a bipartisan and bicameral agreement to pass and fund the President's America Rescue Plan, which in nearly all material respects mirrors the Heroes Act passed by the House Democratic majority on May 15, 2020, nearly nine months ago, only to languish on the Republican Senate Majority Leader's desk while hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans succumbed to the virus and millions of others lost their livelihoods and businesses, and everyone faced an uncertain future.

So if our Republican colleagues are amenable to reaching an agreement on a legislative response that is commensurate to the challenge facing Americans, nothing in the legislation before will preclude that from happening.

But have no doubt, if they refuse to be part of the solution, the unified and bicameral Democratic congressional majority, in coordination with the new Democratic Administration, will take the lead and act boldly to address and overcome the present crisis.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to heed the words of Republican Governor of West Virginia who said colorfully just a few days ago, "At this point in time in this nation, we need to go big. We need to quit counting the egg-sucking legs on the cows and count the cows and just move. And move forward and move right now."

The same sentiment was expressed more eloquently by Abraham Lincoln in 1862 when he memorably wrote:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan action we took last December was a step in the right direction but only a long-delayed down payment; we cannot afford any more delays, especially since Republican stalling already caused a painful lapse in critical unemployment assistance last year, and additional unemployment assistance is set to expire in March.

That why this resolution, which creates a failsafe alternative to debating, voting, and passing the American Rescue Act, is absolutely crucial and the right thing to do, right now.

The American Rescue Plan proposed by President Biden takes a multiprong approach to tackling the public health and economic crises stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic.

To beat the virus and safely reopen schools, the plan will mount a national vaccination program that includes setting up community vaccination sites nationwide and makes the investments necessary to safely reopen schools.

It will also take complementary measures to combat the virus, including scaling up testing and tracing, addressing shortages of personal protective equipment and other critical supplies, investing in high-quality treatments, and addressing health care disparities.

The American Rescue Plan delivers immediate relief to working families bearing the brunt of the crisis by providing \$1,400 per person in direct cash assistance to households across America, bringing the total (including

the \$600 down payment enacted in December) to \$2,000.

Additionally, the plan will also provide direct housing and nutrition assistance to families struggling to get by, expand access to safe and reliable child care and affordable health care, extend and expand unemployment insurance so American workers can pay their bills, and give families with children as well as childless workers a boost through enhanced tax credits.

Mr. Speaker, the American Rescue Plan provides much needed support for communities struggling with the economic fallout, including hard-hit small businesses, especially those owned by entrepreneurs from racial and ethnic backgrounds that have experienced systemic discrimination.

Finally, the plan also provides crucial resources to protect the jobs of first responders, frontline public health workers, teachers, transit workers, and other essential workers that all Americans depend on.

The 2021 budget resolution is not a comprehensive fiscal blueprint for the next 10 years; it is designed solely to provide the option of using reconciliation to deliver critical relief and achieve the goals of the American Rescue Plan.

As such, the total spending and revenue levels in the resolution simply reflect current-law projections adjusted for the estimated costs of the American Rescue Plan.

Once the American Rescue Plan becomes law, Congress will begin its work on a forward-looking, comprehensive budget resolution for 2022 that will provide urgently needed economic support and address longstanding deficits in our communities and underlying inequities in our society, which have been so starkly revealed and exacerbated by COVID-19.

I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 85

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 682) to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 682.

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 447, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 85) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the "National Apprenticeship Act") and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 207, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost

Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahle
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Moultin
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman

NAYS—207

Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde

Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
García (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko

Gosar
Oberholte

Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler

NOT VOTING—5

Ryan
Westerman

□ 1922

Mr. DOGGETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Stevens)	Gottheimer (Panetta)	Lowenthal (Beyer)
Barragán (Beyer)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Lynch (Clark (MA))
Bowman (Clark (MA))	Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Maloney, Carolyn B. (Jeffries)
Buchanan (Arrington)	Hayes (Courtney)	McEachin (Wexton)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Houlahan (Wild)	Meeks (Jeffries)
Carson (Butterfield)	Jayapal (Clark (MA))	Meng (Clark (MA))
Cartwright (Doyle, Michael F.)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Mfume (Brown)
Cohen (Beyer)	Jones (Jacobs (CA))	Moulton (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))	Keating (Clark (MA))	Nadler (Jeffries)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Napolitano (Correa)
DesJarlais (Kustoff)	Kuster (Clark (MA))	Ocasio-Cortez (García (IL))
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawrence (Kildee)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Dingell (Stevens)	Langevin (Courtney)	Porter (Wexton)
Fallon (Nehls)	Larson (CT) (Courtney)	Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Fleischmann (Kustoff)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Gallego (Gomez)	Lieu (Beyer)	Rush (Underwood)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Gomez)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Speier (Scanlon)
	Long (Wagner)	Suozi (Panetta)