

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 105

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered to the Nation by the Honorable John Lewis, late a Representative from the State of Georgia, his remains shall be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol from July 27, 2020, through July 29, 2020, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take all necessary steps for the accomplishment of that purpose.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL TO TRANSFER THE CATAFALQUE SITUATED IN THE EXHIBITION HALL OF THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER TO THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH SERVICES CONDUCTED FOR THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS, LATE A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to transfer the catafalque which is situated in the Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center to the rotunda of the Capitol so that such catafalque may be used in connection with services to be conducted there for the Honorable John Lewis, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 7608, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 7608, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this Sunday, President George H.W. Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act into law and ushered in a new era of equality and justice for people with disabilities.

This law was ushered through Congress with the great leadership of people like Senator Tom Harkin; Congressman Tony Coelho; our current majority leader, STENY HOYER; Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER; and countless others who rallied behind this cause, including from the private sector, people like Justin Dart. This was an extraordinary grassroots effort from around the country.

The ADA guaranteed that the one in four Americans living with a disability have the right to learn, work, and live in their communities, free from discrimination.

As someone who has lived with a disability since the age of 16, I have witnessed the transformation we have made into a more accessible and inclusive society. In fact, without the ADA, I quite possibly wouldn't have the privilege of representing Rhode Island's Second Congressional District in the United States Congress.

However, our work is not yet finished. We must strengthen the promise of the ADA to ensure that all people with disabilities can pursue the life that they choose. Accessible transportation, comprehensive home and community-based services, inclusive workplaces, and universally designed technology are only a few of the challenges that we must tackle moving forward.

Madam Speaker, inclusivity benefits us all, and we must continue fighting for a world where accessibility is the default, not an afterthought.

Happy 30th anniversary to all those who have been a part of this effort to include all those with disabilities in achieving a more active and inclusive life in our country.

□ 1330

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the coming week.

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I will say that on Monday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business, with votes expected to occur, Madam Speaker, approximately 12 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will not be in session as we pay respect to Congressman John Lewis while he lies in state.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that votes on Thursday will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

I know that all Members would like to attend the funeral on Thursday of our brother and great Member and great American John Lewis, however, COVID-19 makes a small-group-only possible. And we will be returning, which is why votes will be delayed until the 6:30 hour.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that last votes could occur later than 3 p.m.

We got out earlier today, and I want to congratulate our floor director, Shuwanza Goff, who got us a schedule that is working very, very well.

The suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will consider two childcare bills. H.R. 7027 would create a \$50 billion Child Care Stabilization Fund within the existing Child Care and Development Block Grant. This would immediately address the problems childcare providers are having in staying open and covering their increased operating costs with limited revenue during this pandemic.

The House will also consider H.R. 7327, Child Care for Economic Recovery Act. This bill would expand the availability of childcare by providing tax relief to families, providers, and employees, significantly increasing funds for the Child Care Entitlement to States programs, providing funds to improve childcare safety and infrastructure and ensure dependent care for essential workers during the pandemic and recognizing all childcare workers are essential.

These two bills are obviously a response to the extraordinary challenge to childcare providers and those who need childcare services.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 7617, the Defense, Commerce, Justice, Science, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Homeland Security, Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 2021 appropriations bill.

With that, we will have passed most—almost 97 percent, maybe 98 percent, of the spending requirements of the Nation for the year to come.

Members are advised that additional legislative items are possible, which we

will be discussing with the minority as well.

Lastly, Members are further advised that conversations are ongoing regarding additional coronavirus relief legislation.

Members should keep their schedules flexible for the week of August 3. Let me remind Members that are listening, and on the floor, the week of August 3 was scheduled to be a week where we would begin the August work period. However, the Senate is not beginning its August work period until August 8. It is very likely, therefore, that we may not reach an agreement on COVID-19 until that week.

I want to tell all Members that it is the intention of the Speaker and myself not to go on a work period until such time as we have passed legislation, hopefully, in a bipartisan way, and sent it to the President and the President signs it, which will help the American people, American businesses, and our country meet the ever-growing, quickly metastasizing crisis that we are confronting.

Further information regarding the timing of a coronavirus relief bill will be announced as soon as possible.

I would simply add that I will make a determination, along with discussions with others, including the minority, next week at some point in time as to exactly how we should schedule. I think it will depend upon where we are in the negotiations and how quickly we can reach an agreement on COVID-19 legislation.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for laying out the course of next week, as well as what could come beyond. We will surely go through some of those items.

I will start with the gentleman's schedule conversations about Monday and Tuesday, the ability for us to pay true tribute to our dear colleague that we lost, John Lewis. This week, of course, we mourn him. We look at the spot where John used to sit and think about the giant that he was.

There were some wonderful tributes here on this House floor earlier this week, and it is very fitting that he will be lying in the rotunda, which is a rare tribute that we pay to special, unique people. He clearly fits that bill as a colleague, but also someone who was a legend, a giant.

We got to serve with someone who we will tell our kids and our grandkids about. For that, we are all better for it. This body is better for John's service, and this country is better for what John Lewis gave, both his blood, his sweat, his passion, his ideas, and his voice.

And if the gentleman wanted to add to that—I know we share those same sympathies for the family, but also the same reverence that we did get to serve with someone who truly was larger than life.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I have spoken a lot about John. I spoke this morning about

John and about his extraordinary chief of staff, Michael Collins, who was such a positive part of his life and who exhibits so many of the traits that made John Lewis a wonderful, good, decent person who loved all of his brothers and sisters, whoever they were, whatever color they had, whatever religion they pursued. John Lewis was the best of us, and we will honor him appropriately.

He will be one of the few Americans who is laid in state in the rotunda, in the center of our democracy, in the symbol of a free people. John Lewis deserves that honor. He enhances that honor by being so honored.

And I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman and thank the leader and the Speaker for providing that privilege to John, to his family, and to all of us, to be able to send him off to a much better place, where I know he already is.

As it relates to the schedule, as the gentleman talked about for potentially coming back in August, the negotiations that are going on between the House and the Senate and the White House on a potential next relief package, clearly we are not in agreement yet.

I know there was a House-passed bill. There is going to be a Senate bill brought forward that is probably a very different direction than the House bill. The White House has been talking about some items that the President liked. I know the President talked today about the payroll tax cut, which is something that I surely would advocate for, as a way to help get people back to work and to help families have more money in their pockets during these tough times and also an incentive to have businesses bring more workers back.

He acknowledged that is probably not something that we will reach agreement on, but he also laid out the olive branch to try to find other ways we can get agreement, if we do get agreement.

I would offer that. And as the gentleman talked about, whatever we do would need to be a bipartisan bill. And I agree, if there is one, it is going to have to be one where we come together, if it is going to be signed by the President.

I would offer that up, as we have looked at the trillions of dollars we have already appropriated—and we came together, Republicans and Democrats in both Chambers, with the White House to send a number of relief packages that have provided dramatic help to millions of families, to millions of small businesses, and they are still struggling.

But as we look at what we spent, we have identified over \$500 billion of that money that still hasn't been spent that is in various accounts. You look at the Paycheck Protection Program, over \$120 billion still unspent. Of course, there are limitations on each of these

funds. It might be possible that we would look at making those existing funds more flexible before we look at spending new dollars, if we can get agreement on that.

I would also like to suggest, as we encourage the opening of schools, where kids can go back to the classroom, there is a healthy debate going on around the country. Many school systems have already made the responsible decision to safely provide an environment where kids can come back in school and they can have that opportunity.

There is a lot of data out there. The American Academy of Pediatrics has laid out strong guidelines for how you can reopen schools safely. And safety clearly has to be the top issue. But they also talk about the danger and the damage to the children, the over 50 million children in this country who do go to in-school settings, the damage that is done by not having that opportunity.

They were denied it, of course, in the middle of a pandemic. Millions of parents became home-schoolers. Myself and my wife were part of that. It was quite an experience. We would be more than happy to allow our children to go back into the classroom. And in New Orleans, they are scheduled to do that. They are going to be reopening schools there, as so many other systems.

But we also know there are some systems that are contemplating not allowing the children to come back in the classroom. I would just hope that we would urge all school systems to find a way to get it done safely. Others are doing it safely. It can be done safely. It doesn't mean it is easy to do it, but we know it can be done. We owe it to those children, the millions of children that would be harmed by not having that in-classroom experience.

You look at the billions of dollars that are still unspent, including money we sent to the States. We sent \$150 billion directly to States for COVID-19 relief. This money, without any change in law, would be eligible for those States to send to their local school systems to buy sanitizer, to buy masks, whatever else they need to safely reopen the schools.

And I would encourage, if there are any limitations that States identify, I would hope they share it with us because I think we can find agreement even there.

But I think we should also look at an opportunity that if school systems are not going to provide that safe environment for kids to come back in the classroom and those parents still want their children back in the classroom, we should look, at least during this pandemic, to allow the dollars to be able to go somewhere else where they are willing to safely educate those children.

If the parents want to make that choice, if one school system is going to deny the children that opportunity, and there are other school systems

that are willing to safely educate those children, we should give them that opportunity to be able to let those dollars follow the children so that they are not denied those opportunities as the American Academy of Pediatrics discussed. I hope we can have all of these conversations in the mix of the negotiations that are ongoing.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

As the gentleman knows, we passed a bill on May 15th that included within that bill \$100 billion for specific assistance—not from the State's excess funds, but specifically for educational institutions to accommodate the expenditures necessary to provide for safe schooling.

I will tell you, I represent five counties. We only have 23 counties in Maryland. We have relatively few political jurisdictions in our State, unlike some, who have many, many and are smaller. All five of the counties that I represent, including one of the largest school districts in the country, Prince George's County, have decided through their elected school boards to open up virtually. And they are following the medical advice and the advice of scientists as to how that can be done.

I think all of us hope that our children can go back to school as quickly as possible. I will tell the gentleman, I have three great-grandchildren, all of them in school. My granddaughter is extraordinarily happy with how the teachers of those three students—one is in pre-K, one is in third grade, and one is in seventh grade—how well the teachers have responded to the parents and to the children. But everybody wants to go back to school.

I will tell you, I received a text from my granddaughter shortly after the President spoke about, well, you have to go back to school, and she said: "Hepop," which is what she calls me—"Hepop, I am terrified about sending our kids back to school."

□ 1345

We need to get an agreement. We passed a bill over 2 months ago through this House, and unfortunately, our friends in the United States Senate have not passed a bill, so we don't have anything to go to conference with.

Unfortunately, yesterday, we learned that the Senate can't agree with itself on the Republican side of the aisle and has not got an agreement with the administration. So at this point in time, as the gentleman knows, we have no alternative, frankly, to discuss. But we are hopeful that that will happen soon. We are hopeful that at least the Senate Republicans will come to an agreement on an alternative they want to suggest, and then we can discuss that.

Frankly, in order for the Senate to pass something, it has to be bipartisan, and there has been no bipartisan agree-

ment reached at this point either. So, we will wait. Hopefully, there will be an alternative, and hopefully, we can move forward quickly.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I agree. We worked very closely over a period of weeks to come up with the CARES Act, which I have heard from so many families and small businesses throughout my district, as well as through my colleagues and their districts, how much of a lifeline that was, truly saving millions of jobs, saving millions of small businesses so that they can still work to reopen safely, hopefully get back to the successes they were having before.

We know we are not there yet, but with the encouraging signs we are seeing on the medical front, with both therapies as well as vaccines, showing incredible promise in the testing stages through Operation Warp Speed, where we are able to test on thousands of people. Nobody is cutting any corners, but we have a wider array of people to test now because the disease is so widespread, not only in America but throughout the world.

So, that testing that is being done in a very aggressive fashion is showing incredible promise. Hopefully, that gets us to a point where we have a vaccine. But as we know, today, we are not there yet.

So, hopefully, we can continue working to help those businesses get back open or stay open and help families through the tough time. That is just why I would suggest that, as we haven't gotten an agreement, whether the Senate hasn't even gotten an agreement amongst themselves, as the gentleman pointed out. The bill that came out of the House recently was not bipartisan, but we were able earlier, through the CARES Act, to have a bipartisan agreement. So, the ability is still there.

But, in the meantime, while those negotiations aren't resulting in an agreement, I would just offer up that there are hundreds of billions, well over \$500 billion, that we have appropriated that haven't been spent and, in some of those categories, probably won't be spent because of the limitations.

Maybe we can look at providing more flexibility with existing dollars before we talk about another trillion, to allow more uses for that for the people who need it as a bridge to maybe get to another point, or a bridge to get to a healthier economy that takes off on its own. Hopefully, that would be one more option we can put on the table.

I would ask if we do continue these negotiations, I know the gentleman referred to the possibility that that first week in August, we may come back. If we are to come back, and the majority decides to bring Congress back at a time that it is not currently scheduled, could we at least get a 72-hour notice, as normally is the case, so that Members can adjust their schedules and know what is ahead of us without very short notice?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, let me respond to my friend.

Obviously, if there is money that we have already appropriated that is not needed and not disbursed, I think the gentleman is right that we can reallocate that and repurpose that money. So, that can be part of it. But we sort of need to get to some parameters that the other side, meaning the Senate, can put forward.

Secondly, let me say, I did, in fact, say when we were out for some period of time that I would give 72 hours' notice. I can't promise that today. The reason I can't promise it today is because we are going to have literally millions of people who are without help after the 31st of this month.

As you know, the unemployment insurance goes out. In the HEROES bill, of course, we extended that unemployment insurance until January 31 of next year, as you know.

What I can say and what I have told my Members is that if in fact we can't get an agreement, and it doesn't appear that we can come to the floor Monday or Tuesday, I think that is the 3rd or the 4th of August—I think the 1st and 2nd of August are Saturday and Sunday. So, the 3rd and 4th or 5th, if we can't get an agreement before then, there is no point in having Members sitting in their offices, twiddling their thumbs. I agree with that.

I will have discussions with you and with Leader MCCARTHY. We will certainly not want to keep your Members here just waiting while negotiations are going on.

I certainly will assure every Member that they will have 24 hours' notice. But the need for action is so great and the consequences of inaction so harmful, that I think we need to act as soon as we possibly can. And that 48 hours difference may make a difference to a lot of people. So, I will give an assurance that there will be 24 hours' notice, but I cannot give a 72-hour notice assurance.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that. Maybe as we get toward the middle or end of next week, we will have a better idea where we are, and that number could change. Maybe there is an agreement by then, so we will continue this discussion.

I appreciate the gentleman's candor and willingness to work with us, to try to make sure that the Members are at least aware of where they will be, if they already have plans to do other things, that they can adjust that in a reasonable amount of time to address these challenges.

Finally, I would want to ask the gentleman, I know we have had a debate a number of times about this experiment with proxy voting. It was going to expire in July, and it was renewed until August. I don't know if the gentleman knows yet if the intention is to continue going on with that, but there have been a number of cases where you have had Members that were here one

day and sent in a note the very same day saying they are unable to be here and then proxy-voted or were out on a boat or other things.

I would hope this process ends, that we get back to voting in person. It has been very safe. The environment here is safe. Members are wearing masks when they are in close contact with one another. Obviously, we are at a very safe social distance, and you don't need to wear a mask in this kind of environment. But when you are close, you have seen the Members following the protocols. There is a lot of safety equipment around.

I would just hope we could get back to the ability to be here physically. It is a much better working environment when you can see your other colleagues and share experiences and talk about best practices that we are seeing in each of our districts, people that are doing things better, that we can help other people in other districts do. It is hard to get that when you are just not here.

I would hope that we would work toward getting back to as normal of a process as possible, recognizing where we are, but where we are doing that work here in the Capitol in the same place together at a safe distance, but at least here physically.

I would hope we could continue to have this conversation. Clearly, there are a few more weeks and no decision has to be made yet. I don't know if the gentleman has already made a decision.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question and his comments. Let me say this. I think we have a different perspective on where we are in this country. In point of fact, I think there is reason for great, great, grave concern about what we see as an explosion, not just of testing. If it were just testing—but it is of hospitalizations and of deaths.

We have seen a geometric increase in the number of sick people, not just because they were tested, but because of a very heightened number of sick people. There are some areas of the country which, frankly, leadership was very vigorous in imposing what some felt were draconian requirements, but which did, in fact, apparently make a significant difference in the transmittal of the disease one to another.

So we see the situation as more dire. We certainly agree with you that we are hopeful to accelerate—we have made big investments in not only a vaccine but therapeutics. There are some therapeutics that seem to be working in some respects. The sooner we can get there, the more confidence there will be in the American people that they can reengage, that we can restart and not only see one another, but do business with one another, and commerce can be pursued vigorously.

We are not heartened by the figures. I know our President talks about things getting better, but we don't see it that way. We don't think the figures

confirm that, which is sad for our country. Therefore, we need to continue to take the precautions we need. But having said that, let me speak to the proxy voting.

I know your side has been very concerned about the proxy voting. A, I don't think the proxy voting has made any difference in the outcomes of the decisions we have made in this House. B, a relatively small number—I know the last time we met, there were some 30. I am not sure this time, I think it is less this time.

Let me say, I agree with the gentleman. I have talked to some Members. It is not for when you have another thing to do. It is not for doing something you would rather do. I can name a number of Members—I won't—on your side and my side who have significant health problems and challenges, either themselves or in their families, and, therefore, they are concerned about not so much getting together on this floor, but we don't live on this floor. We have places that we live and eat, and we go to the cleaners.

So, it is not just on this floor where we have wipes and sanitizer and a way to keep us healthy, and we do wear masks, most people wear masks. Unfortunately, all of us don't wear masks, and I think that is not good judgment.

But the proxy voting has really not made any difference in whether this House has been able to act.

How long will it go on? Right now, we are seeing an explosion of cases, an explosion of infections. Certainly, during that explosion, it is no time to say to people—and, again, I almost want to mention names because you will know the folks. They are not feigning it. Most of them are somewhere around my age who are very concerned about their health, the health of their families, and the health of those to whom they will go home from here if they come here.

I think the gentleman is absolutely right. Speaker PELOSI, myself, Leader MCCARTHY, Leader MCCONNELL, and I think Senator SCHUMER, have all said, as you have just said, it is better for us to be here together, to interchange with one another, discuss with one another, to make suggestions to one another, to have that personal engagement that I think makes for a healthier legislative environment.

But until we can do that with safety and ensure Members that if they come here that they will not be a danger for themselves or for others—and the doctors advise us that the pandemic is still a danger to us—then we will continue to follow this rule.

But I want to assure you that I make it very clear to Members: The rule contemplates a danger to health to individuals or others, and that is why the proxy is available to them.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, look, obviously, we can have a disagreement over whether or not there should be a proxy voting system. But if there is going to be, I would just hope that we

would see an increase in the integrity of that.

I mean, for a Member to literally be here physically on the House floor, and then later in that same day, sign a document—it is not a notarized document, but you are signing a document on your stationery to the Clerk of House saying you are physically unable to be here when you were physically here that day. It reduces the integrity when we see roughly a 15 percent increase in people that are here all week that all of a sudden sign a document saying they physically can't be here on the fly-out day. It reduces the integrity.

So if it is going to continue—clearly, our side does not want to see it continue, but if your side feels it should continue, I hope you would at least look at strengthening the integrity so if somebody signs a document, that you have confidence that that document is an accurate depiction to the Clerk of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

□ 1400

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, what I said to him was I agree with him on that point. But if Mr. SCALISE wants to make it again, he can make it.

But I made it to my Members. I agree. It is for illness. It is for the threat of illness. It is not for convenience.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I respect that, and I appreciate the gentleman discussing that. I know we have additional negotiations that will go on, hopefully, next week. And we will have a clearer picture if those will result in actual legislation we can come together on and get a clearer picture of the timeline.

But at least until then, I know I appreciate the opportunity to not only be able to pay tribute to our dear friend John Lewis here in this Chamber where we served together but then to go in the rotunda, as the gentleman acknowledged, in a rare moment when a nonformer President of the United States gets to lie in that beautiful rotunda. No one is more fitting of that honor than the great John Lewis.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman if he has anything else.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).