

United States Postal Service is under attack by the current administration.

This is an assault on our democracy and our economy, and it is hurting Americans across the country. It is hurting the veteran in my district from Pasadena, Texas, who receives his medications from the VA through the mail and who is now worried about what will happen to him if his medications get delayed.

It is hurting my neighbor from Lindale Park who cares for her elderly mother and didn't receive her Social Security check in the mail on time, further stressing her financial situation and leaving her unable to pay her mother's utilities.

And it is hurting the small businesses in my neighborhood in the Houston region, already crippled by this pandemic, that depend on the Postal Service to mail out payments and products.

Madam Speaker, we cannot stand by as people are hurting. The Postal Service delivers money, medicines, merchandise, and, yes, mail-in ballots.

Madam Speaker, we must keep the Postal Service running. People are hurting.

HONORING WORK OF OFFICER BROOKS YANDLE

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life-saving work of Officer Brooks Yandle of the White Lake Police Department.

Over the weekend of July 4, Officer Yandle responded to a call about a 43-year-old woman unresponsive to CPR. Upon arriving, Officer Yandle determined that the victim had overdosed on heroin, took quick action to resuscitate her, and saved her life.

This is not the first time Officer Yandle has acted to save lives. In 2016, he saved a grandmother and her four grandchildren found unconscious and suffering from carbon monoxide poisoning.

Officer Yandle's courage and decisiveness has saved multiple lives, and he is a credit to the noble profession of law enforcement. I am proud to pay tribute today to him and to the entire White Lake Police Department.

CALLING FOR EQUALITY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this morning, today, we have arrived in Washington to fight for postal workers, the United States Postal Service, in H.R. 8015. But I take this moment to acknowledge close to almost 175,000 dead Americans who have died from

COVID-19. I applaud those who have taken a moment out of their lives to march for those who have passed and mourn for those families.

This is not America. And I acknowledge something else that comes to my attention that hurts my heart as a mother, and that is the Trump administration's policy to separate children. That the United Nations has condemned it as torture and abuse of children—some upwards of 5,000 children. Their own White House immigration specialists, if you will, want it to be 25,000 children. This is not America.

Today, we fight for those who have come to our doors in rain, snow, or shine. We must also fight for the children and never again in America see any policy that snatches children away from their families. Immigrant or non-immigrant, we are Americans who have values that stand for something—equality and justice.

CONTROLLING INVASIVE ASIAN CARP

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, the United States Congress needs to get back to work. We need to start working on the issues that deal with our constituents.

One of those that is of great concern in Tennessee is invasive Asian carp. They are a nuisance in too many of our Nation's waterways, preventing folks from fully enjoying our Nation's lakes, rivers, and streams, and destroying our ecosystem.

Many in my district, including the residents of Tellico Village, have expressed legitimate concerns to folks at TVA and others over Asian carp and their potential spread into our local waters, and I have been proud to work with them to tackle this issue.

Madam Speaker, to control the spread of these pests, I have worked to secure \$25 million in funding in fiscal year 2021. If approved by the Senate, these resources, combined with language in the Water Resources Development Act, would allow researchers to study the reproductive habits of Asian carp in the Tennessee and Cumberland River basins so we are better equipped to battle these invaders.

I thank both the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure for working with my office on these requests. Problematic Asian carp harass boaters, fishermen, and swimmers across this country of ours. My constituents are passionate about getting the Asian carp population under control and keeping them out of our waters.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with them further on this important local issue.

RECOGNIZING JOSEPH FABRIZIO AND HOLLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL'S EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work and dedication of Mr. Joe Fabrizio and his eighth grade students at Holland Middle School in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Each year, Mr. Fabrizio and his students write letters to our office on a variety of topics, and each year, reading these letters is something that our entire staff looks very much forward to.

Madam Speaker, one of the most important things that one can do as a citizen is to communicate with your elected officials by writing a letter, sending an email, making a call, or paying a visit. These students are playing their part in the political process, and these students at Holland Middle School know that the decisions that our government makes today will impact them, and eventually, it will be their turn to make decisions in their government.

I think my colleagues in the House would very much benefit from being able to review these letters, and so I will include the letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Madam Speaker, by taking the time to write our elected officials regarding issues important to them, it shows that these students truly care about our district and our Nation, and it should give all of us faith in the future of our Nation.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8015, DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-480) on the resolution (H. Res. 1092) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1092 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1092

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House without intervention of any question of consideration the bill (H.R. 8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, and for other purposes. All points of order against

consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-61, modified by the amendment printed in 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 intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Friday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1092, providing for consideration of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act, under a closed rule.

The rule itself executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman MALONEY, provides 2 hours of general debate on the bill, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, we are here today because our democracy is being eroded by this administration. It is under siege on all fronts.

I read the report released this week by the Senate Intelligence Committee, a Republican-led committee. It was truly shocking. It found that some in the President's campaign created "notable counterintelligence vulnerabilities."

Make no mistake, they welcomed help from Russia, and they knowingly used intelligence from Putin's regime.

While this report was released, the President continued to attack his political enemies. He continued all of the lies. This week, he even floated the idea that America should hold a do-over of the upcoming election in November if he doesn't like the outcome.

Are you kidding me?

On top of this, this administration has moved to dismantle the United States Postal Service. We have all seen

the images of mailboxes uprooted. Others have been chained shut. Sorting machines have disappeared. Mail service has slowed to a crawl for some Americans, threatening the delivery of everything from medications to Social Security checks.

Did you know, Madam Speaker, that 80 percent of our veterans' prescription medications are delivered by mail? Why would anyone want to place their health in harm's way?

Why, Madam Speaker? Because this administration knows that more Americans than ever are likely to vote by mail in November. The U.S. Postal Service expects 10 times the normal amount of election mail because of the coronavirus pandemic. This President fears that if more people vote, the less likely he is to win a second term.

Now, we all recently mourned the passing of our dear friend, the great John Lewis. Not too long ago, he stood right here on this floor and he said: "When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up; you have to say something; you have to do something."

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing today cannot be dismissed as Donald being Donald or the President just continuing to be provocative. This is scary stuff. It is frightening, and we have to do something.

In the face of extraordinary public pressure and action by this majority, the Postmaster General promised to halt further changes until after election day. But I have to tell you, I wouldn't trust this administration to tell me the correct time. Not only was there nothing in his statement about reversing the damage that has been already done, there was nothing about reinstalling boxes or sorting machines and nothing about treating election material as first-class mail.

But the Postmaster General made clear, since, that he has no intention of undoing what he has done. He doesn't plan on lifting a finger. He said as much in the Senate hearing yesterday. He made clear that he didn't even study the impact of these changes on our seniors before they were implemented. He didn't study the impact on our veterans first. Apparently, he just made them, Madam Speaker, struggling Americans be damned.

This administration isn't going to do a single thing about it, and this is why Congress must act.

Now, my friends on the other side have tried to claim there is no problem here. They have waved around charts that are weeks and weeks old to try to pretend that everything is just fine, that everything is just beautiful.

Well, I don't need some outdated statistics to tell me what is going on today, Madam Speaker. I don't need empty rhetoric from the occupant of the White House or Mr. DeJoy. My constituents are my evidence. They have flooded my office with calls. They have stopped me on the street. Something is happening here, whether this adminis-

tration or its allies want to admit it or not.

Before my friends on the other side try to paint this issue as some kind of liberal conspiracy, let me remind them: There is no money for hungry families here, although they badly need it; there is no funding for State and local governments here, though they are pleading with all of us for relief. We have already acted on all that. It is MITCH MCCONNELL over in the Senate who is determined to do absolutely nothing.

All this bill does is get the Postal Service back to where it was at the start of the year and provide them with the resources they need, not just to process an influx of ballots, but to continue delivering mail, including Americans' Social Security checks and medications. It ensures that they are able to continue delivering to places in rural America that their competitors just don't go, and it supports the Postal Service's more than 630,000 hard-working employees. And we all owe them a debt of gratitude for their service, especially during this pandemic.

Madam Speaker, if we don't undermine and tear apart the Postal Service, then they can handle the increase in mail-in ballots. They handled two to three times the volume of mail and packages at Christmastime, and they are determined to handle the volume of election-related mail. But they need their equipment; they need to pay their workers; they need confidence that management won't try to undercut them on the job; and they need support from this Congress, Democrats and Republicans.

That is it. This is all pretty bare bones, Madam Speaker. I don't see why in the world that Republicans won't join us on this. It shouldn't be a radical concept to suggest that, in the United States of America, every vote should count, whether it is for Donald Trump, Joe Biden, or someone else.

It shouldn't be a tough call to support the United States Postal Service. More than 90 percent of Americans view this agency favorably because it is their lifeline in so many ways.

Madam Speaker, this is a five-alarm fire on our democracy. I think our country is worth fighting for. I hope all my colleagues join together to help us save it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding, but that is probably where our agreement is going to end today.

We are not here because democracy is under siege. We are here because the Democratic House leadership is underperforming. We haven't gotten appropriations bills negotiated to the White House. We haven't gotten transportation bills negotiated to the White House. We haven't gotten water infrastructure bills negotiated to the White

House. I can go on and on and on. And we are here today with yet another bill that there is absolutely no effort to negotiate and send to the White House.

Madam Speaker, you are going to hear more about Donald Trump today than you are going to hear about the Postal Service today, and that is because we are not here about the Postal Service. We are here for another round of attacks on President Trump.

I get it. Folks don't like President Trump on this side of the aisle. I get it. Folks have concerns about President Trump's rhetoric on all sides of the aisle.

But the Postal Service has \$10 billion. I asked the question yesterday, Madam Speaker: For the \$25 billion bailout package we are here about today, how much of that money are we going to spend this year? How much do we need to protect the election infrastructure my friend from Massachusetts just described? I couldn't get an answer. Folks didn't know an answer.

Conveniently, we are going to have the Postmaster General called before the House for a hearing for these answers in about 48 hours. About 2 days after we have passed this bill, we are going to get all the answers about why this bill may or may not be necessary.

What my friend from Massachusetts said—I have gotten pessimistic, in light of our 6-hour Rules Committee hearing yesterday. I actually agree with my friend from Massachusetts on much more. He is right that we owe a thank-you to our men and women of the Postal Service for the work that they are doing.

The previous Postmaster General came to Congress in the spring, worried that mail volume was going to collapse and the Postal Service was going to enter a period of financial instability. The truth, Madam Speaker, is just the opposite. Postal office deliveries have exploded. Folks are doing e-commerce like never before. Our men and women of the Postal Service are working harder than ever before, delivering more packages today than they were 6 months ago. And we owe them a big, big thank-you for their work during these times. My friend from Massachusetts is right: It is a lifeline for so many families.

Madam Speaker, it is an election year. Who believes that serving their constituents comes from denying veterans access to prescription drugs? Nobody. If that is what this was about, we would have gotten together, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, Congress and the White House, and we would be moving legislation in a cooperative way.

We heard from the ranking Republican yesterday on the committee. He wasn't consulted in these conversations. He wasn't brought in to these conversations. There are no Republican amendments here. There is no conversation going on with the Senate. This is another wasteful partisan exercise in a time when—my friend from

Massachusetts is absolutely right—there are real crises that need to be addressed.

I had hoped when we were called back on a Saturday, Madam Speaker, it would have been to address one of those crises. But the truth is, it is just the punctuation mark at the end of the Democratic National Convention week. And to the leadership's credit, they scheduled it so that it wouldn't interfere with the Republican National Convention next week.

How convenient that our scheduling was dictated by two political conventions, because that is the only reason that we are here today, Madam Speaker: politics.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am just getting a little sick and tired of all of the excuses as to why my Republican friends don't want to join us in helping the American people.

My friend mentioned the appropriations bills. Well, with all due respect, we passed almost all of them here in the House. My friend, the Republican leader in the Senate, hasn't done a damn thing, hasn't passed one.

We passed the HEROES Act, which would have helped the Postal Service, which would have provided relief to cities and towns, which would have provided assistance to those in this country who are going hungry. The Senate majority leader hasn't done a damn thing, not anything, hasn't lifted a finger for anybody. And we have even agreed to meet him halfway. He still won't negotiate.

On an infrastructure bill, we passed an infrastructure bill here. Negotiate with the Senate? They haven't passed a damn thing. It is malpractice. If politicians could be sued for malpractice, then the Senate majority leader would be sued. This is ridiculous.

And here we are with a crisis in the Postal Service. Mail has slowed down all across the country. Members are getting calls, including Republican Members. And what is the response? Oh, well, we will just let it go. You know, we will say we need to do better. We will deal with this another day.

This is ridiculous, it is unconscionable, and I am tired of the excuses.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, this President is on a warpath to destroy the Postal Service and, through that, our elections.

After months of hearing this President, and now Republican Members of Congress, spread conspiracy theories and misinformation about voting by mail, he has made GOP megadonor Louis DeJoy his new chief of chaos in voter suppression.

In an attack on the Postal Service, DeJoy has removed mail processing equipment, collection boxes, and cut

back on overtime. Ninety Democrats, led by Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK and me, already demanded his immediate removal.

Because, on top of this blatant voter suppression, Trump and DeJoy are hurting millions who depend on the Postal Service every day: seniors and veterans waiting for lifesaving medications, families waiting for paychecks, small businesses with delayed packages whose very survival is already threatened by COVID-19.

On Thursday, the Progressive Caucus held a hearing and heard from David Williams, the former vice president of the Postal Service Board of Directors, who resigned in protest to Trump's actions. What he told us, unfortunately, shocked no one: that the Postal Service was fully prepared for mail voting until this administration manufactured an intentional crisis; that DeJoy wasn't selected by the firm that was hired to find a new Postmaster General, but he was the only candidate interviewed and was unqualified to lead the Postal Service; and that Steve Mnuchin sought intrusive control over core Postal Service operations and wanted to impose a pricing practice that would ruin the Postal Service.

This chaos is not the result of a pandemic. This chaos was manufactured by the administration and is intentional.

That is why Congress is acting today.

We are reversing Louis DeJoy's disastrous actions and providing the Postal Service with the funding it so desperately needs. We won't let anyone dismantle our Postal Service. The Postal Service belongs to the people.

□ 1045

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Ordinarily, I am concerned that I only have 30 minutes for Rule Committee debate, but the lunacy that we are hearing down here today makes me glad that we are going to be done with this in 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, you know when Elijah Cummings chaired the committee and MARK MEADOWS was the ranking member, now President Trump's chief of staff, we came together to do Postal Service reforms because we all know the Postal Service needs to be reformed. We all know this. We could do it today, if it was about Postal Service reform, if it was about Postal Service improvement, but it is not.

What is the solution today? Throw more money at a problem. We don't trust the Postmaster General, the other side says. We don't trust the President, the other side says. So what is the solution to the manufactured crisis? Give \$25 billion to the Postmaster General and the President of the United States.

In response to my assertion that this House is a do-nothing Congress because it fails to negotiate with the Senate and the White House, my friend from Massachusetts lists half a dozen bills

that this House passed unilaterally with no effort to negotiate with the Senate or negotiate with the White House.

Madam Speaker, if what we want to do is come and talk, we have a wonderful Chamber in which to do it. If what we want to do is come in and get something done, it can only get done together. This is yet another example of the House leadership's failure to operate in a partnership fashion.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), one of the greatest negotiators in the House, a gentleman who has a long history of bipartisanship, and thus, legislative success, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend for yielding and very much appreciate his leadership on our committee.

Madam Speaker, I want to rise to oppose both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Before I do, though, I include in the RECORD four newspaper articles discussing the majority's concern about the Postal Service. The first is a Wall Street Journal editorial; a column by Rich Lowry appearing in the New York Post; a column by Byron York, appearing in the Washington Examiner; and a column by Ruth Goldway, a former commissioner of the Postal Service, appearing in the New York Times.

All four articles make it clear that the majority's reasons for bringing this legislation, frankly, are ludicrous, and that what they are proposing actually will make it more difficult to reform.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 2020]

NANCY PELOSI GOES POLITICALLY POSTAL
(By the Editorial Board)

Speaker Nancy Pelosi is calling the House back into session this week to address fears that the U.S. Postal Service is being infiltrated by alien lizard people posing as letter carriers. OK, it isn't quite that bad. The actual conspiracy theory holds that President Trump is strangling the USPS to hack the November election.

But talk about "unsubstantiated," as the press likes to call Donald Trump's Twitter emissions. Democrats should be deeply embarrassed that their leadership has embraced such claims. Two Congressmen, including Democratic Caucus Chairman Hakeem Jeffries, wrote to the FBI on Monday to urge, if you can believe it, a criminal investigation of Postmaster General Louis DeJoy.

"This conspiracy theory is the most far-flung thing I think I've ever heard," says Stephen Kearney, who worked at the USPS for 33 years, including as treasurer and a senior vice president. "DeJoy was not appointed by President Trump," but by the USPS's bipartisan governors. (Who, as it happens, selected him unanimously.)

"You can find valid operational reasons for the actions taken by the Postal Service so far," says Mike Plunkett, another longtime USPS executive who now leads the Association for Postal Commerce. "In no way do I detect any criminality behind them, and I'm at a loss as to how one would reach that conclusion."

The Democratic letter to the FBI cites news reports that the USPS is decommissioning hundreds of mail-sorting machines.

But the context is that overall mail volume has fallen 33% since 2006. "They've been taking machines out of service for years now, and I've been encouraging them to do it more aggressively," says Hamilton Davison, the president of the American Catalog Mailers Association. "I think that's a good thing for America, because we don't want to pay for stuff that we don't need."

Mr. Kearney, who now runs the Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers, concurs. "It's obvious, to be efficient and not waste money, you need to take out some of that capacity," he says. His group has similarly been urging productivity improvements, "because if they don't do that, our postage rates are going to go way up." A leaked USPS document floating in the online ether is titled "Equipment Reduction." But it's dated May 15, and Mr. DeJoy took over June 15.

Another claim is that the USPS is pulling blue collection bins off the street en masse. "They're going around literally with tractor trailers picking up mailboxes," Joe Biden said last week. "I mean, it's bizarre!" The USPS says it has nearly 142,000 boxes across the country, which are adjusted as volume and costs dictate. In August 2016, the USPS's Inspector General said that "the number of collection boxes declined by more than 12,000 in the past 5 years." Voter suppression by the Obama Administration?

Alarmed Twitter users last week posted a photo of mailboxes on a flatbed truck in New Jersey. Oops: "Morristown Mayor Tim Dougherty said the mailboxes were being replaced with new anti-fishing boxes," the local newspaper explained. On Monday the USPS said it would postpone this security upgrade for 90 days "while we evaluate our customers' concerns"—in other words, to keep jittery partisans on the internet from losing their minds before Nov. 3.

Mr. DeJoy is being knocked for trying to cut overtime costs. But is it any wonder? The day he was sworn in, the Inspector General reported that in 2019 the post office "spent \$1.1 billion in mail processing overtime and penalty overtime, \$280 million in late and extra transportation, and \$2.9 billion in delivery overtime and penalty overtime costs." For context, the USPS's overall loss that year was \$8.8 billion.

Mrs. Pelosi is trying to put on a political show, starring Democrats as the saviors of the post office. She says she wants to pass a bill that "prohibits the Postal Service from implementing any changes to operations or level of service it had in place on January 1." Also in the mix may be a \$25 billion cash infusion. Then Chuck Schumer will demand that the Senate come back to town for the same vote. By the way the letter-carriers union endorsed Joe Biden on the weekend.

This is a made-for-TV phony political crisis. The USPS has long-term challenges, but enough money to last into 2021. Mr. DeJoy says there's "ample capacity to deliver all election mail." Some states have startlingly lax ballot deadlines, but nobody can pretend with a straight face that it's the post office's fault. Democrats have also scheduled a hearing for next Monday so they can yell at Mr. DeJoy in person. How long before Rep. Adam Schiff says it's another Russia-Donald Trump conspiracy to steal the election?

[Aug. 17, 2020]

THE LEFT'S LUNATIC 'POSTAL' CONSPIRACY
THEORY

(By Rich Lowry)

At this rate, Postmaster General Louis DeJoy will be lucky if he isn't arrested and tried for treason before a people's tribunal.

DeJoy has quickly replaced Vladimir Putin as the man that progressive opinion will hold responsible if Trump wins a second term in November.

According to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, DeJoy is a "complicit crony" aiding Trump's effort to sabotage American democracy. She believes the two have hatched a plot to delay mail-in voting and disenfranchise countless Americans prior to the election.

Protesters over the weekend showed up at DeJoy's Washington apartment and North Carolina home. Two Democratic congressmen have called for a criminal inquiry into his changes at the postal service, and he will testify at a House hearing next week.

In tried and true fashion, President Trump has stoked suspicions by saying that he opposes a \$25 billion postal-service bailout in the latest Democratic COVID-relief bill. According to Trump, blocking this measure—and \$3 billion in election aid to the states—will prevent universal mail-in voting.

But the bailout doesn't have anything to do with mail-in voting, and given the billions of pieces of mail handled by the post office every week, it surely can handle the increased volume from mail-in voting.

It is true that Postmaster General DeJoy is a major Trump donor. He made his fortune in shipping and logistics, though, and he was selected by the postal service's board of governors.

Little did he know when he took over the agency in June that he'd soon have a starring role in the country's latest psychodrama. Every change at the postal service is now seen through the prism of a belief that the agency is a tool of creeping authoritarianism.

Letter collection boxes are being removed—never mind that this has been an ongoing process for years. Underused boxes are decommissioned or moved to higher-traffic areas. In 2009, The Washington Post reported that 200,000 boxes had been shelved over the prior two decades. In 2016, the inspector general noted that another 12,000 collection boxes had been cut over the previous five years.

Letter collection boxes all of the sudden have big red locks on them—well, yeah, as an off-hours device to prevent the theft of mail, something the service has also done for years.

The postal service is deactivating mail-sorting machines—right, and there was a plan for this prior to DeJoy becoming postmaster general, and it has been long discussed in response to the declining volume of mail.

DeJoy is cutting back on overtime—indeed he is, because artificially swollen overtime is an enormous expense that he hopes to eliminate with a more rational delivery system.

Democrats and much of the media make it sound as though the post office was an efficient, smooth-running agency before DeJoy took charge and then, at Trump's behest, transformed it into place struggling to keep up with broadbased changes in how we communicate.

In reality, the post office has lost nearly \$80 billion since 2007, and it lost more than \$2 billion last quarter. Unless the service finds a way to innovate, it is headed for bankruptcy.

This is the impetus for DeJoy's reforms, which should be welcomed by all the people now caterwauling about how essential the post office is to the American way of life.

DeJoy has been adamant that the postal service will do its job regarding mail-in ballots. The post office's recent warnings to states that they should be mindful of how quickly ballots can be delivered were played up as yet another assault on mail-in balloting. To the contrary, they were intended to avoid unrealistically late deadlines for mail-in voting that could create a trainwreck in November.

But in their inflamed state, Democrats want a villain—if not a foreign potentate,

then the guy in charge of delivering the mail.

[From the Washington Examiner]

A REALITY-BASED LOOK AT TRUMP AND THE POST OFFICE

(By Byron York)

The news is filled with reports of President Trump's "assault" on the U.S. Postal Service. The president, Democrats and some in the media say, is deliberately slowing mail delivery and crippling the Postal Service so that it cannot handle an anticipated flood of voting by mail in the presidential election. Former President Barack Obama said Trump is trying to "actively kneecap" the Postal Service to suppress the vote. Speaker Nancy Pelosi has called the House back into session this week and has set an "urgent hearing" for Aug. 24, demanding Postmaster General Louis DeJoy and the head of the Postal Service Board of Governors testify "to address the sabotage of the Postal Service."

Some of the accusations have grown so frantic that they resemble the frenzy of a couple of years ago over the allegation, from many of the same people, that Trump had conspired with Russia to fix the 2016 election. Now, it's the Postal Service. But what actually is going on? Here is a brief look at some of the issues involved.

142.5 BILLION PIECES OF MAIL

The idea that the Postal Service will not be able to handle the volume of mail in the election, or not be able to handle it within normal Postal Service time guidelines, does not make much sense. According to its most recent annual report, last year, in fiscal year 2019, the Postal Service handled 142.5 billion pieces of mail. "On a typical day, our 633,000 employees physically process and deliver 471 million mailpieces to nearly 160 million delivery points," the report says. This year, that number is higher, given the Postal Service's delivery of census forms and stimulus checks. Those alone added about 450 million additional pieces of mail.

In 2016, about 136 million Americans voted in the presidential election. The number will probably be a bit higher this year. If officials sent ballots to every single American registered to vote, about 158 million people, and then 140 million people returned ballots, the roughly 298 million pieces of mail handled over the course of several weeks would be well within the Postal Service's ability to handle. Of course, officials will not send a ballot to every American registered to vote, and not every voter will vote by mail. Whatever the final number is, the ballots that are cast by mail will not cripple a system that delivers 471 million pieces of mail every day.

There are, of course, compelling examples of election dysfunction, most notably the mess New York made of some of its congressional primaries this summer. But rather than representing a Postal Service problem, that was because some states are unprepared for a dramatic increase of voting by mail. The states have to prepare the ballots, address them, and process and count them when the Postal Service delivers them. That is the focus of the entirely legitimate fears of a possible vote-counting disaster this year. But it's not the Postal Service.

\$25 BILLION FOR WHAT?

Some news reports have left the impression that the Postal Service will not be able to handle mail-in ballots without an immediate infusion of money from Congress. That is not the case.

The Postal Service is not funded by a regular appropriation. It is, instead, an "independent agency" and is expected to support itself, beyond a yearly appropriation of about \$55 million to cover the costs of mail

for the blind and overseas balloting in elections.

The Postal Service has lost money for a very long time. In fiscal year 2019, it had operating revenues of \$71.1 billion and operating expenses of \$79.9 billion, leaving it with a deficit of \$8.8 billion. At the moment, Postal Service officials have told Congress, it has about \$14 billion in cash on hand, putting it on the road to fiscal insolvency (without further aid) in late 2021.

In the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act, or CARES Act, the \$2 trillion relief measure passed in March, Congress gave the Postal Service a \$10 billion borrowing authority. After the bill became law, there were negotiations between the Postal Service and the Treasury Department on the terms of the borrowing; a deal was announced in July. The ability to borrow \$10 billion, the postmaster general said, would "delay the approaching liquidity crisis."

That was all the aid for the Postal Service in the CARES Act. Completely separately, the bill also gave \$400 million to something called the Election Assistance Commission for distribution to states to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, domestically or internationally, for the 2020 federal election cycle."

The next mega-relief package, a \$3 trillion bill known as the Health and Economic Recovery Omnibus Emergency Solutions Act, or HEROES Act, was passed by the House in May by a vote of 208 to 199. The winning total of 208 votes was comprised of 207 Democrats and one Republican. Fourteen Democrats and one independent voted against the measure. The bill has so far gone nowhere in the Republican-controlled Senate.

The House HEROES Act would give \$25 billion to the Postal Service in what is essentially a bailout. The bill mentions nothing about helping the Postal Service handle the upcoming election or any other election. Indeed, the only stipulation at all placed on the \$25 billion is that the Postal Service, "during the coronavirus emergency, shall prioritize the purchase of, and make available to all Postal Service employees and facilities, personal protective equipment, including gloves, masks, and sanitizers, and shall conduct additional cleaning and sanitizing of Postal Service facilities and delivery vehicles." If the House Democrats who wrote and passed the bill intended the money to be spent specifically for elections, they did not say so in the text of the legislation.

Separate from the Postal Service provisions, the bill would give \$3.6 billion to the Election Assistance Commission for distribution to states "for contingency planning, preparation, and resilience of elections for federal office." There has been some confusion about that; some discussion of the current controversy has left the impression that Democrats want \$3.6 billion for the Postal Service for the election. In fact, the \$3.6 billion would be for the states' election use. In neither the CARES Act, which is now law, nor the HEROES Act, which has been passed by the House but not the Senate, is there any money given to the Postal Service specifically for the election. In any event, the Postal Service has the capacity to handle the election and does not need any additional money specifically to do the job.

THE LATEST REFORM PROPOSAL

Whatever its other concerns at the moment, the Postal Service does have chronic financial problems. This year, Trump chose DeJoy, who made a fortune in shipping and logistics and whose former company was a contractor of the Postal Service for many years, as the new postmaster general. (DeJoy is also a major donor to Republicans and the Trump campaign.) DeJoy has attempted to

deal with some of the Postal Service's systemic problems with a pilot program to make deliveries more efficient while reducing the Postal Service's crippling overtime costs, which added up to more than \$1 billion in fiscal year 2018.

In the past, postal delivery worked this way: A worker would arrive in the morning and work on various things in the office—sorting mail, handling holds on mail, waiting for incoming mail to arrive to prepare for delivery. That often involved waiting around for hours and then starting an actual delivery route later in the day. Once started, a route has to be finished, and that involved workers going into overtime as they delivered through their route as evening approached.

DeJoy's plan, now being implemented in a pilot program in about 200 cities, is called Expedited to Street/Afternoon Sortation, or ESAS. Under it, a worker would arrive in the morning, collect all the mail that was ready to go out, and head out for delivery—"retrieve, load, and go." Then, after finishing the delivery route, the carrier would return to the office and do in the afternoon the office work that used to be done in the morning. That way, when the end of his or her shift arrived, that would be the end of the workday, with no overtime incurred. Mail that arrived to the office in the afternoon, while the carrier was doing office work, would be delivered in the next morning's route. It would be ready and waiting when the carrier arrived for "retrieve, load, and go."

The effect to customers would be that mail that was delivered to the office in the afternoon would be delivered the next morning, instead of that evening. The effect to the Postal Service would be to save an enormous amount of money in overtime.

In addition, there have been reports of the Postal Service removing collection boxes and sorting machines. While some Democrats and journalists have portrayed that as another effort toward voter suppression, the fact is the number of letters the Postal Service handles each year has declined for 20 years since the arrival of email. In those last two decades, the Postal Service has downsized its capabilities as the number of letters handled has decreased. Here is how the Washington Post described the situation, specifically concerning sorting machines: "Purchased when letters not packages made up a greater share of postal work, the bulky and aging machines can be expensive to maintain and take up floor space postal leaders say would be better devoted to boxes. Removing underused machines would make the overall system more efficient, postal leaders say. The Postal Service has cut back on mail-sorting equipment for years since mail volume began to decline in the 2000s."

Some Democrats have characterized the current reform efforts, much needed in an agency losing so much money, as part of the president's master plan to steal the election. But together, the Expedited to Street/Afternoon Sortation program and the cutback in sorting capacity would seem to be reasonable measures of the type the Postal Service needs to implement, and indeed has been implementing over the years. Yet this is what Democrats, and some of their allies in the press, have labeled as an "assault" on the Postal Service.

NIGHTMARE SCENARIOS

Many news accounts have included stories of Americans suffering from interruptions in Postal Service deliveries. For example, a story in the New York Times headlined "Postal Crisis Ripples Across Nation As Election Looms" included the story of Victoria Brownworth, a freelance journalist in

Philadelphia. “For Ms. Brownworth, who was paralyzed four years ago, the mail is her lifeline,” the New York Times said, “delivering prescriptions and checks and mail-in ballots to her Philadelphia home. But that lifeline has snapped. She said she had received mail just twice in the past three weeks, and she dreaded November’s election, worried that her ballot would suffer the same fate as the oxygen tube that she ordered three weeks ago—and that had still not arrived.”

Other news reports have included many other examples. They are largely, if not entirely, anecdotal. While each is serious for the person involved, at the moment, it is impossible to tell how much of a national problem they represent. People who keep track of the Postal Service suspect that many of the stories are rooted in workforce availability problems related to the coronavirus pandemic, plus the changes in operations (for example, closing a facility to clean it during an outbreak) that have become part of life during the pandemic. The Postal Service would not be the only large organization that has found it impossible to operate as usual during the crisis.

There is also the fact that the Postal Service does, on occasion, fail to deliver the mail. In its annual reports, it includes data on “performance outcomes.” For example, for first-class mail, which is the type of mail that would be most employed for election purposes, the goal in fiscal year 2019 was to deliver 96% of letters in one to three business days. Its actual performance was 92%. So 8% of first-class letters were not delivered on time. Now, consider that the Postal Service handled 54.9 billion pieces of first-class mail in fiscal year 2019. That is more than 4 billion pieces of first-class mail that were not delivered on time. And that, in a fraught political situation, could be the basis for a lot of anecdotes in news articles.

Many of those anecdotes, by the way, appear to have made it to the media with the help of the Postal Service unions. There are two major unions representing Postal Service workers. On Friday, the largest postal union, the National Association of Letter Carriers, endorsed Democratic candidate Joe Biden for president. In June, another union, the American Postal Workers Union, endorsed Biden as well. In 2016, both unions endorsed Hillary Clinton. In 2008 and 2012, both unions endorsed Barack Obama. In 2004, they endorsed John Kerry. And so on.

One more note about delivery times. A few days ago, the Washington Post published a story headlined “Postal Service warns 46 states their voters could be disenfranchised by delayed mail-in ballots.” The paper obtained letters from Postal Service leadership to various states informing them that some of their election deadlines are “incongruous with the Postal Service’s delivery standards.” The resulting “mismatch,” the Postal Service said, “creates a risk that ballots requested near the deadline under state law will not be returned by mail in time to be counted under your laws as we understand them.” In other words, several states are not giving the Postal Service long enough to deliver a ballot to a voter and then deliver the filled-in ballot to the state election board. For example, if a state’s law allows a voter to request a ballot seven days before the general election but also requires that votes must be received by election day to be counted—that would be a recipe for a lot of votes not being counted. It was an entirely reasonable concern on the part of the Postal Service, and it is a problem more for the states than the Postal Service. Yet media discussion of the story suggested it was just another chapter in what one source in the Washington Post account called “the

weaponization of the U.S. Postal Service for the president’s electoral purposes.”

TRUMP CONFUSES EVERYTHING

Despite the heated rhetoric, many of the Postal Service’s problems are relatively clear, if extremely difficult to solve. In the context of the upcoming election, Trump has repeatedly added confusion to the situation, most recently with extended discussions in a television interview on Thursday and a press conference on Friday.

In the press conference, Trump was asked, “If the Democrats were to give you some of what you want . . . would you be willing to accept the \$25 billion for the Postal Service, including the three and a half billion dollars to handle mail-in voting?” As has happened many times in this controversy, the question conflated the Democrats’ proposal for \$25 billion for the Postal Service and the request for \$3.6 billion for the Election Assistance Commission. In any event, Trump answered, “Sure, if they give us what we want.” He then began to elaborate on other policy priorities.

“So, if they were to give you that, you would sign off for the money for the Postal Service?”

“Yeah, but they’re not giving it to me,” Trump said. “They’re giving it to the American people.”

“But if they were to agree to that—”

“Yeah, I would,” Trump said. “I would certainly do that. Sure, I would do that. Yeah.”

The next day, Friday, Trump spoke to Fox News’s Maria Bartiromo. “They [Democrats] want \$3.5 billion for the mail-in votes, OK, universal mail-in ballots, \$3.5 billion,” Trump said. “They want \$25 billion for the post office. Now, they need that money in order to have the post office work so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots. Now in the meantime, they aren’t getting there. By the way, those are just two items. But if they don’t get those two items, that means you can’t have universal mail-in voting because they’re not equipped to have it.”

In fact, while the \$3.5 billion proposal for the Election Assistance Commission (it is actually \$3.6 billion) is specifically for the purpose of facilitating mail-in voting, the \$25 billion for the Postal Service is basically a bailout. In April, the previous postmaster general, Megan Brennan, citing a “steep drop” in mail volume during the coronavirus crisis, had asked for far more—\$75 billion. The Postal Service didn’t get anywhere near that much money in the first relief bill, the CARES Act—just \$10 billion in borrowing authority. So when the second relief mega-bill came up, Democrats threw in \$25 billion for the Postal Service. It was not about mail-in voting. (On Sunday morning, White House chief of staff Mark Meadows, who as a congressman followed postal issues closely, said the administration offered House Democrats \$10 billion for the Postal Service.)

Nevertheless, the president connected the two and suggested that the Postal Service needed the \$25 billion, and the Election Assistance Commission needed \$3.5 billion, to handle ballots in the election, and that he would not give it to them for that very reason.

“How would you like to have \$3.5 billion, billion, for mail-in voting?” Trump asked. “So, if you don’t have it—do you know how much money that is? Nobody has any idea . . . Oh, \$3.5 billion. They want \$25 billion for the Post Office because the Post Office is going to have to go to town to get these ridiculous ballots in . . . Now, if we don’t make a deal, that means they don’t get the money. That means they can’t have universal mail-in voting. They just can’t have it.”

The bottom line was that Trump made a mess of the issue. He didn’t make a case against universal mail-in voting, which does not exist in the United States. He didn’t make clear why Democrats wanted \$25 billion for the post office. He suggested that not agreeing to the \$25 billion was a way to stop universal mail-in voting, which it is not. He didn’t address the serious problems at the Postal Service which need attention and do not have anything to do with voting. In all, he left the issue more confused than it had been beforehand—and that was saying something.

DEMOCRATS SMELL VICTORY

On Friday, the Washington Post published a story headlined “Trump’s assault on the U.S. Postal Service gives Democrats a new campaign message.” Put aside the casual use of the word “assault.” The fact is, Pelosi, Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, and other top Democrats are jumping on the Postal Service controversy with both feet. “Democrats are already blanketing the airwaves, latching on to the opportunity to highlight support [for the Postal Service],” the paper reported. Obama has joined in, tweeting that seniors and veterans and small businesses “can’t be collateral damage for an administration more concerned with suppressing the vote than suppressing a virus.”

The Democratic commentariat cheered and signaled it is ready to press the issue until election day. “Trump donor & Postmaster General Louis DeJoy should be in the crosshairs of every relevant congressional committee, inspector general, prosecutor, investigative journalist, whistleblower, class action lawyer, editorial board, etc. etc. etc.,” tweeted former U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara. No doubt that is precisely what will happen in the Democratic world and some major media outlets between now and Nov. 3. But shouldn’t someone, sometime take a look at what is actually happening?

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 2020]

I WAS A POSTAL SERVICE REGULATOR FOR 18 YEARS. DON’T PANIC.

(By Ruth Y. Goldway)

President Trump has threatened to withhold funds from the United States Postal Service. The new postmaster general, Louis DeJoy, has embarked on cost-cutting measures to eliminate overtime and remove sorting machines. These actions have created worries that Americans, reluctant to walk into voting booths because of Covid-19, will be unable to vote by mail this year.

I served as a regulator of the Postal Service for nearly 18 years under three presidents and I urge everyone to be calm. Don’t fall prey to the alarmists on both sides of this debate. The Postal Service is not incapacitated. It is still fully capable of delivering the mail. The focus of our collective concerns should be on how the Postal Service can improve the speed of delivery for election mail.

First, the president is wrong about the Postal Service’s finances. While the agency indeed has financial problems, as a result of a huge increase in packages being sent through the system and a credit line through the CARES Act, it has access to about \$25 billion in cash. Its own forecasts predict that it will have enough money to operate into 2021.

The Postal Service’s shaky financial situation has to do in large part with the drop in first-class mail (typically used for letters), about 30 percent less than a decade ago. But the service’s expensive, overbuilt infrastructure can absorb the addition of more mail in 2020—including election mail that is mailed to and sent back by every voter in every state.

The new postmaster general's management team still includes many knowledgeable and seasoned executives. And the Postal Service has over 500,000 employees who are remarkably honest, dedicated and used to working through emergencies: hurricanes, snow storms, social unrest and pandemics.

While the Postal Service has contemplated many different approaches to modernizing and improving efficiency, there has not been a consensus on how much the service should reduce costs. It is not at all surprising that Mr. DeJoy's choice of particularly visible cuts has raised alarms.

The Office of the Inspector General of the Postal Service has agreed to a review of the changes. And Congress has been called back to conduct its own review next week, restore trust in the institution and ensure that voting by mail proceeds smoothly.

Given that there is enough money and perhaps more if the president agrees to additional bailout funds; that there is plenty of capacity in the system; and that voting by mail can alleviate a health threat to the nation, the Postal Service should be made to handle all election mail as if it were first-class mail. This is where the policy discussions surrounding the Postal Service should settle.

Most election-related mail is sent at non-profit rates. The 1993 National Voter Registration Act requires the Postal Service to charge state and local election offices the same price for postage as nonprofit mailers. The Postal Service has a history of providing extra care and attention to election-related mail, on the level of first-class mail: usually two to four days for delivery. A special logo and bar code identifiers were created so that mail sorters were able to pull election mail out from the routine mail stream to be sure it was delivered as soon as possible.

But a recent letter sent by Thomas J. Marshall, the general counsel for the Postal Service, to election officials around the country seems to suggest that election mail will now be treated like regular nonprofit mail (typically three to 10 days for delivery) and may take as long as 15 days. This is not acceptable.

The Postal Service has the capacity to ensure that ballots sent to voters arrive on time and that ballots dropped into the system by voters are postmarked and delivered in times that accord with state and local guidelines. In their meeting with Congress next week, the leaders of the Postal Service should guarantee that election mail will continue to be treated as first-class mail. The Congress should agree that there will be no additional financial support for the Postal Service without this promise.

But state and local election officials must also recognize the possibilities of delays and plan for earlier mailings so there will be more days for ballots to be returned. Voters must be reminded to send in requests for ballots, change of address, voter registration forms and especially filled-out ballots as early as possible.

The Postal Service does indeed need a bailout from Congress so that it can be counted on to deliver the mail, medicines and other vital products for years to come. It needs funds to rebuild its more than 30,000 post offices and aging vehicle fleet to reduce its reliance on temporary workers and to broaden the range of services it provides. But these problems do not affect this year's election.

Americans must continue to support the Postal Service, whose existence is enshrined in our Constitution, by using its vote-by-mail services to save lives now and to protect our democracy in the future.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for a very simple rea-

son. It is a silly rule. It actually violates the rules that my friends passed at the beginning of this Congress. The legislation before us has not gone through any committee, has not been marked up, has not been debated, has not been amended.

My friend said at the beginning of the Congress they wouldn't bring legislation like that to the floor, they conveniently waived that rule yesterday. So here it comes with no committee procedure or markup. We had a number of amendments, Madam Speaker, that were presented to the committee, none of them were made in order.

I offered an amendment for what is called an open rule, where any Member could come down here and put forward what they thought would be a better idea since we had no opportunity to do that in committee. That too was rejected.

So this rule is a take-it-or-leave-it ultimatum from the majority, and it means you can pass it in the House, but it is not going anywhere else.

Now, let's turn to the bill itself. My friends say that—we are going to hear a lot of bad things about the Postmaster General in the course of the morning. I have never met him. I don't know him. The people that do know him say that he is a really good guy, but I don't know. We are going to hear a lot of terrible things about him. But at the end of the day my friends are going to vote to give him \$25 billion, and they are going to do it in a bill that has no reforms in it, just says you can't change anything. Now, how smart is that?

You can't change anything in an institution that is losing \$8 to \$9 billion every single year. We don't trust the person who heads this, but we are going to give him \$25 billion. Do we need that money? Absolutely not. The post office tells us they have \$15 billion on hand, they have access to a \$10 billion line of credit that will more than take them for a year from now. So we don't need to be spending this money right now. It is a silly, silly bill.

But I want to give my friends some free political advice. They want to pass this bill. They want to get it through the Senate. They want to get it to the President's desk. They want to get it signed. I believe that. If that is true, make it bigger. Do exactly what my friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee said, let's put some stuff in it that we agree on.

The President of the United States says, I think every family in America that makes less than \$75,000 a year needs help right now, they need \$1,200 per adult, \$500 per kid, that would be \$3,400, a one-time payment for a family of four. Attach that to this, it would pass the floor unanimously in a bipartisan fashion and be picked up by the Senate. And the President said, through his chief of staff, I will sign something like that.

You could do something a little bit different. We are all having our schools

open right now all across the country. My friends passed \$100 billion in the HEROES Act for it. The President said, actually, we think it would take about \$105 billion. Put that on this and help every school district in America. But my friends chose not to do that, but if you do, it will pass here, it will pass the Senate, and the President would sign it.

Let's talk about unemployment. The President said, hey, we think the \$600 extra is a little high, but while we are negotiating, by the way, we will keep paying it. My friends on the other side said, no, they can do without the \$600. And then the President said, well, we think \$200 is the right number, but we can go to \$400. Put that on here. Every unemployed person in America would get \$400 a week. Right now, thanks to the Speaker and the minority leader in the United States Senate, they are getting zero. The only help they are getting is from the President who is using Herculean executive orders to try and get them some additional relief.

So this is a joke. This is, as my friend the distinguished Member from Georgia said, a theatrical moment punctuating the two conventions, the Democratic Convention and leading into ours. No legislation is going to happen because my friends aren't serious about legislation.

No money is going to get to the post office because it can't pass the Senate, and the post office doesn't need it anyway. So we are going to have an entertaining couple of hours. Fortunately, it is on a Saturday morning, so I don't think very many Americans are going to waste their time listening to this.

When my friends want to get serious, when they want to negotiate, when they want to move something to the floor, we will be ready.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge rejection to the rule and rejection of the bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I would love to spend weeks and weeks discussing this in committee, but the truth is that is what the Trump administration wants, to run out the clock before the November elections. So trust in our democracy is undermined, and they can act like there is some conspiracy if he loses.

I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about process, but I really question their judgment here. They thought that dealing with cheese was such a national emergency last Congress that they used emergency powers to bring a bill on that topic to the floor during a government shutdown no less.

But today, as seniors can't get life-saving medications and our veterans can't get social security checks, they want to hit pause. Our Postal Service is in chaos. Give me a break.

You know, my friends say they don't know who the Postmaster General is.

Let me tell you who he is. He is like the least qualified candidate for the job. He is a big, mega donor to Donald Trump. And my Republican friends are believing everything Mr. DeJoy says, like claiming there is no mail shutdown.

Well, let me remind them what the Postmaster General wrote in a recent memo that these changes have had: "Unintended consequences that have impacted our overall service levels." Those are his words, Madam Speaker.

He is transforming the Postal Service all right. Transforming it from reliable to chaotic right before an election. So even if you trust Mr. DeJoy, which I do not, even he acknowledges that there is something happening here.

Those on the other side of the aisle cannot have it both ways here. This administration apparently won't lift a finger to fix this problem, but this Congress is acting. And I would respectfully urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us. Help the American people. They should be your priority, not the guy in the White House.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I rise with a sense of urgency. I rise because the Postal Service is near collapse. I rise in the name of Army Sergeant Retired Boudreau, stage 4 cancer, and Katy, stage 4 breast cancer. These are the desperate people that are feeling the brunt of a collapsed Postal Service. The voices I listen to are the letter carriers who are denied the ability to deliver mail, or the postal workers who have no machines to deliver mail.

H.R. 8015 is an emergency SOS act, Delivering for America. It is crucial that we meet today, not because we are political, because we had to get here as fast as we could to be able to acknowledge that the Postal Service is a crucial lifeline for Americans.

Madam Speaker, I submitted an amendment. I am glad that the Rules Committee moved on a closed rule. This is an emergency. Later on today, I will introduce Protecting Democracy by Securing the Right to Vote, that will allow you to request ballots online, by phone, or mail, and most importantly, setting a 10-business-day mail return time for ballots sent by mail and are postmarked on election day.

Why?

Because as we are working today to ensure that mail ballots are safe and secure under H.R. 8015, we have seniors who are listening to the scare tactics that are being said from the highest office in the land. They are frightened.

Yesterday, I was at the house of a blind senior citizen, she can't get out to vote, she will have to do a mail ballot.

So I rise enthusiastically to support the H.R. 8015 rule because we are in a collapse of the postal system. It is ur-

gent. We need \$25 billion, and we need to do it now. I ask my colleagues to support it, and let it be bipartisan.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule for H.R. 8015, the Delivering For America Act.

I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for the work of the Rules Committee to bring this important measure to the Floor of the House for consideration.

I also thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership in drafting H.R. 8015, which is being debated under the Rule.

I offered an Amendment to improve this very good bill, but it was not included in the Rule for H.R. 8015.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, if it had been included would have ensured that ballots postmarked on or before Election Day would have ten business days following that date to be delivered by the Postal Service to local elections officials to have it counted for the election.

I offered this amendment out of consideration for the nearness of the election and the likelihood that the U.S. Postmaster will not change the policies that have led to the decommissioning of mail sorters and mailboxes, which is slowing down the U.S. Mail.

The job of the United States Postal Service is to receive, process, and deliver the mail without favor or special consideration to anyone.

I applaud the work done in the underlying bill to provide relief to the Postal Service, and I appreciate the desire to narrowly focus the bill only on addressing the issues arising out of intentional efforts to disrupt mail service.

I believe that we must be more aggressive in our approach to protect the election and make sure that Election Day does not become a victim of COVID-19.

I will work with my colleagues to ensure that all available means are provided to ensure that every voter, no matter their party or preference has access to cast a vote that will be counted in the November election.

I support the Rule for this bill because it provides much-needed protection to postal workers and relief for those who are dependent on the mail service for sustaining life and health as well as commercial needs and business.

In 2019, the Postal Service:

Delivered 142.6 billion pieces of mail to 260 million addresses in America;

Delivered 1.2 billion prescriptions, including most of the medications ordered by the VA;

Employed 633,108 of our friends and neighbors, including more than 100,000 veterans;

Served 70 percent of businesses with fewer than ten employees;

Had a 90 percent favorability rating, making it the most popular federal agency.

The Postal Service:

Is often the only delivery option for rural America where service is not profitable;

Delivers 48 percent of the world's mail with one of the world's largest civilian vehicle fleets;

Is a vital service for the more than 18 million seniors who do not use the Internet.

The Postal Service has become a pharmacy of choice for millions of Americans who live in pharmacy deserts—locations where there are no pharmacies to serve communities.

The Postal Service is an essential component to Veterans' health because they deliver medicines to our veterans.

The VA has now confirmed to us that the United States Postal Service (USPS), which is

responsible for delivering about 90 percent of all VA mail order prescriptions, has indeed been delayed in delivering these critical medications by an average of almost 25 percent over the past year, with many locations experiencing much more significant delays.

Under the urgent need to fix the postal service, we must not forget that the Postal Service employees are essential workers in COVID-19, and if they are essential it means that the work they do is essential.

In addition to delivering prescriptions and business mail, they are also delivering democracy to millions of voters who will need to cast their ballot by mail this election year to reduce their risk of contracting COVID-19.

The U.S. mail service has provided essential mail service for absentee voting for well over 100 years by enabling Union troops to vote during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korean War, Vietnam War, Iraqi Freedom, and to this day.

Since that time, absentee or not, in-person voting has grown in popularity across the United States and is now a welcomed and valued component for assuring citizen participation in public elections.

In 2016, 20.9 percent of all votes cast in that federal election were done so by absentee ballots and this year that number is expected to be much higher due to COVID-19.

The attack on the viability and value of absentee voting should be viewed as just one component of many assaults on our elections system that may make this a very difficult election year.

This view is shaped by the decades of elections filled with disinformation and misinformation tactics designed to suppress or repress black, LatinX, and young voters from voting or having their votes counted.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in support of the Rule for H.R. 8015.

Mr. WOODALL, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS, Madam Speaker, this bill, H.R. 8015, does seem to be rushed. And here is the biggest thing, it is not going to address the core problem that exists in the United States Postal Service.

This bill appropriates a \$25 billion bailout using emergency supplemental funding, removing it from the previously agreed to bipartisan budget agreement numbers, and prohibits the Postal Service from making any reforms until next year at the earliest.

So if this bill is intended to improve efficiency or effectiveness of the Postal Service, I would just simply ask: How in the world is it supposed to do that if it is prohibited from making any changes?

The Postal Service is in trouble, every Member of this Chamber, Republican or Democrat, understands this. We should be deeply concerned about the precarious position of the Postal Service. But despite the narratives, this problem has been decades in the making.

The Postal Service's operational pains have been festering literally for

decades. Since 2007 mail volumes have fallen year after year as American consumers and businesses have chosen digital communication over letters and mailed advertising. Over the same period, the number of addresses requiring delivery and retirement obligations for retired Postal Service employees have continued to grow. So in very simple terms, revenues have fallen, and costs have risen for over a decade.

□ 1100

This novel coronavirus' impact on the economy is only exacerbating this situation. The Postal Service lost \$2.2 billion in the second quarter of this year. H.R. 8015 kicks the can down the road and forces the Postal Service to continue to sustain financial losses. No reforms to modernize the Postal Service, so we should expect its fiscal health to worsen.

Now, in spite of all the heated rhetoric today, the Postal Service will not collapse tonight. The Postal Service has informed Congress that it has enough cash on hand to remain solvent through August 2021. That is a year from now if you are doing the math at home. And Congress has already provided an additional lifeline by raising the Postal Service's loan authority by \$10 billion.

Instead of voting on this rushed and partisan bill, Members of this Chamber could work together to solve the problem. Congress has time to work through the proper committees, provide the proper oversight, provide the proper reforms, and preserve this essential service.

Let's vote against this bill today, a dictatorial bill brought to us by the Speaker of the House, H.R. 8015, and work together in finding a meaningful and lasting fix for the United States Postal Service.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have heard some of the Republicans clamor last night in the Rules Committee all about statistics.

Well, let's look at some. This is from the Postal Service's most recent quarterly report. It compares on-time delivery for single-piece first-class mail this fiscal year so far as compared to last fiscal year. Do you see the red line? It is going in the wrong direction. Mail is slowing. People aren't getting deliveries that they need on time. This is just through the end of June. We don't know what truly happened in July or so far in August.

Our constituents are not lying to us. Their mail is delayed. Their medications are delayed.

Yesterday, we were told: You know, people who are on Social Security don't have to worry because they get all their Social Security checks electronically. We know that is not true. We know that close to 1 million people get Social Security and SSI through the mail.

So, this is real. This is happening. And we need to do something about it.

The fact that this is happening in the middle of a pandemic right before an

election, I mean, I don't believe in coincidences. This is deliberate, and it is shocking. As I said before, this is a five-alarm fire on our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article, "Quit Interfering and Save the Postal Service," by the former chair of the Board of Governors of the Postal Service, David Fineman.

[Aug. 5, 2020]

QUIT INTERFERING AND SAVE THE POSTAL SERVICE

(By S. David Fineman)

The U.S. Postal Service is in trouble and needs help just like the airlines, large and small corporations, and consumers. There are ways to save it if Congress takes action very soon.

Where to start with its problems? The USPS is losing billions because of the pandemic. Its leadership has said running out of money is a question of when, not if. Its board of governors temporarily lost its quorum this year and is now made up only of Trump administration appointees. The president of the United States called the Postal Service a "joke." And now state election officials are warning that reduced mail service could interfere with mail-in ballots in November.

I served as a governor of the United States Postal Service from 1995 through 2005. I was nominated by President Bill Clinton, and served as chairman during the administration of President George W. Bush. By law, the USPS should have nine members on its board, five of one party and four of another. During my tenure, there was never any interference by the president in the business of the USPS, like there is currently.

What is happening now is unprecedented, and we wonder why. Let us hope it is not to disturb the election process and mail-in ballots.

During my first year on the board, it became clear the rate-making process, which decides how much one pays to mail a letter or a package, made no sense. Not until 2004 was there movement on any legislation in Congress. Eventually the chairman of the committee overseeing the Postal Service, Dan Burton (R-Ind.), and the ranking member, Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), agreed on the outline of a bill. The bill, with a few changes, passed the House of Representatives, the Senate, and then was signed into law by Bush in 2006.

One section of that legislation called for the USPS to prefund its pension obligations for 75 years. I remember meeting with the then-postmaster general, and after a thorough briefing, we both concluded the USPS would never have the necessary funds to and maybe naivety, I believed congress would amend the law in due time to eliminate that burden.

So here we are in 2020, in the middle of a pandemic. Congress and the administration cannot agree on how to fix the USPS. Everyone in the so-called postal community, including its unions, agree the prefunding requirement is not needed. Let us get legislation to eliminate the prefunding requirement passed.

What else can be done? First, let us stop the parochial mindset of Congress. The USPS has needed to right-size for some time, and not just close post offices. Because of population shifts, it can consolidate large processing plants, so they can process mail from various states and municipalities.

Last week, Treasury released \$10 billion already allocated to the USPS, with conditions that are at best questionable. It was required to share with Treasury details of contracts it negotiated with Amazon and others. Congress should allocate without any conditions, just like it has bailed out multinational corporations as a result of the pandemic.

If we believe what we hear from the administration and the postmaster general they seem to have two solutions: First, raise the price of packages, although the rate-making process has confirmed the prices set were fair, and within the confines of the law. Second, cut the pay of the unionized workforce, which has already suffered thousands of coronavirus illnesses and, at last count, at least 60 deaths.

If the price of packages is raised, who pays? The consumer and small businesses, not just on packages sent by USPS, but by every private delivery service. That is the reality of how business works, and to deny it is not dealing with reality.

As USPS raises its prices, you can be assured that the private delivery services will raise their prices. Considering the present composition of Congress, the provisions of the law regarding how union contracts are negotiated is not about to change.

With the pandemic, the USPS is needed more than ever before. Small businesses and the average American rely on delivery of mail six days a week. They need to get their checks, their letters, and packages, on time.

The USPS needs help! There is a way to fix it!

The administration must stop holding the USPS hostage to its own private agenda. Rural America and the inner city population would suffer more than anyone else. The solutions are clear. Let us just get it done.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, "I'm writing to you today after having skipped a day of my high blood pressure medication for the first time."

"I have not seen a Postal Service carrier in my neighborhood for a week or more, not received mail for 10 days. The last couple pieces of mail were 30 days late."

"I am a small business owner. I am in a real bind. I usually ship packages to customers. Switching to UPS or FedEx would be too expensive. I would likely lose customers."

These are just a few of the thousands of messages that my office has received from constituents who have been caught in the crosshairs of this administration's war on the U.S. Postal Service.

We are here today to deliver a message to this administration: Don't mess with the USPS.

This vital public service is essential in our everyday lives. In a pandemic, it is a lifeline.

These are the real consequences of this administration's ill-conceived efficiency measures, which have disrupted postal service across the country. Those consequences have made their way to the doorsteps of seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, and countless families and businesses, large and small.

As millions of Americans are expected to vote by mail, many for the first time, we need to give Americans the peace of mind that their mail will be processed swiftly. That is why I am

proud to support the Delivering for America Act.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I want to solve every single one of those problems that she just laid out. Those are absolutely bipartisan concerns. This bill solves none of them.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), another member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

“Nancy Pelosi Goes Politically Postal.” That’s the catchy title of a recent op-ed written by The Wall Street Journal editorial board, and that is the reason we are here today, for phony political theater to once again bash President Trump just in time for the Sunday talk shows and the Republican National Convention. And just like all the other times, the media will lap it right up.

Wouldn’t it be nice if we were here today on a Saturday voting on a negotiated COVID relief package to help the American people that could actually be signed into law? But sadly, instead, we are here talking about a postal bill, one The Wall Street Journal editorial board called a “made-for-TV phony political crisis.” Boy, did they get that right.

Let’s review the facts.

A task force recommends that the U.S. Postal Service overhaul their business model in order to return it to sustainability because expenses have outpaced revenue for 13 straight years, and they lost \$8.8 billion in 2019 alone.

The new Postmaster General is unanimously selected by a bipartisan Board of Governors, not President Trump. The Postmaster General starts making some changes in an attempt to make the post office more sustainable, as recommended by the task force—you know, similar to the types of changes that were made under the Obama administration in the past.

The Postmaster General worries that some States allow voters to request mail-in ballots too close to the election day and is afraid that there is not enough turnaround time for those ballots to get back in time, so he sends a courtesy letter to those States, recommending they tell voters to mail in their ballots early so they can get them in time.

Guess what? Democrats freak out, blame Trump, say he is trying to influence the election, even though Trump doesn’t have control over the Postmaster General, and run to the ever-so-willing media to spread a new Trump conspiracy theory.

Seems insane but all too typical for the Trump-hating Democrats to me.

But don’t take my word for it, let’s see what Stephen Kearney, a 33-year veteran employee, former Treasurer, and Senior Vice President of the U.S. Postal Service said: “This conspiracy theory is the most far-flung thing I think I have ever heard.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just say again for the RECORD because we hear this on the other side: Wouldn’t it be nice if we were here negotiating a larger package on a whole range of things. Well, we actually passed something in the House called the HEROES Act. The Senate has passed nothing. The reason why is because Republicans are fighting with Republicans. They can’t agree on what to do, so they have done nothing. So, we are negotiating with an empty chair.

If my friends really want to help, they ought to pick up the phone, and they ought to call MITCH MCCONNELL and tell him to do something, to actually do something.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, mail is an essential government service and a critical lifeline for many, especially during this pandemic.

What have operational changes made to the postal system accomplished? Parts of the country are having their mail delayed by up to a week or more. This is harming veterans, seniors, and our rural communities.

What has the Postmaster General already done? Curtailed overtime; restricted deliveries; eliminated sorting machines; in Hartford, Connecticut, in the parking lot there is a dismantled machine; removed mailboxes; prohibiting employees from making late mail deliveries, directing them to leave mail undelivered at distribution centers overnight; warned 46 States and the District of Columbia that it could not guarantee all ballots cast by mail for the November election will arrive in time to be counted.

Yes, this is about our democracy, as well. This administration is undermining a pillar of our democracy, voting for a partisan purpose. Obstructing the Postal Service for political purposes is illegal. It is illegal to interfere with the mail.

During this unprecedented time, we must be streamlining, not sabotaging, voting by mail.

The administration wants to destroy the public’s faith and trust in the public service. No, the American people are not going to let you do it. I might add, the Postal Service has a 90 percent favorability rating. It is the most popular Federal agency. Would that we had a 90 percent favorability rating.

We must fight for this essential component of our democracy and of people’s lives. We will, through rain, shine, or sleet, or President Donald Trump.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the ranking member of one of the committees that is near and dear to my heart, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, a good friend, and a member of the freshman class of 2010.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend ROB WOODALL for yielding.

When I was a kid, I couldn’t wait for Saturday morning. Saturday morning in our house, my brothers and sisters, we would get up, and we couldn’t wait to watch our favorite cartoons.

Now, decades later, here I am again, on the floor of the House of Representatives, watching a cartoon about the only outcome this debate is going to have today: one of entertainment value, nothing substantive.

The chairman of the Rules Committee called this a five-alarm fire. Now that the Democratic Convention has concluded and the Republican Convention is about to begin, we have a catastrophe.

It is not going to build infrastructure. It is not going to give aid to people suffering from the pandemic. It is not going to fund the government by October 1. It is not going to become law.

Just like the previous attempts, my friends on the other side of the aisle have had to derail a duly-elected President. This, too, will fail. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am sad that the gentleman thinks this is entertaining. We have veterans who are calling our offices whose medications have been delayed getting to them. We have some people on Social Security and on SSI who are worried that their checks are not going to get to them. We have small businesses that are calling to complain.

This is a crisis that this administration produced all on its own. And whether it is designed, as some of us fear, to try to create more chaos around the election—and by the way, this is what Donald Trump said about the money that we have in this bill: “They need that money in order to have the post office work so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots.”

Did anybody ever think that they would see a President of the United States who would publicly say that he doesn’t want every vote to count? This is outrageous, and I cannot believe that my friends on the other side of the aisle, who I know are getting the same calls we are, are totally fine with doing nothing.

□ 1115

Well, maybe if some of my Republican friends would join with us, it might send a message to the White House that they have to respond, they have to do the right thing.

It is the complicity; it is the indifference that I just can’t understand given what is going on in this country right now.

So we have been complaining about this for weeks—this didn’t just happen this week, but for weeks—but it is now out of control, and we have to do something.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, over the past few weeks, we have seen the reports of decommissioned sorting machines, removal of postboxes, and the cutting back of hours for the U.S. Postal Service employees.

In my district of Sacramento, I have never seen such an outcry, an outrage amongst my neighbors and constituents.

This is serious business. We are feeling the effects of delayed mail delivery and seeing the real-life consequences of these operational changes: Financial documents are late; prescriptions are stuck in transit; and we worry about our future ballots being counted.

That is why this administration's attacks have alarmed so many Americans. We recognize it is about more than just getting letters from A to B. It is about the fabric of our democracy.

The Postmaster General has made his political preferences and business interests no secret. The U.S. Postal Service should not be manipulated as a political or business tool.

Hundreds of millions of Americans across this country rely on the Postal Service for lifesaving medications, Social Security benefits, paychecks, and mail-in ballots. The Delivering for America Act will help ensure that those services continue as needed.

This bill takes critical steps to halt the damage being done, while providing \$25 billion to put the Postal Service back on track.

While the Postmaster has recently claimed that he will halt operational changes until after the election, he has also stated he has no intention of re-commissioning sorting machines and postboxes that have already been shuttered. The damage has already been done, and it is unacceptable.

We must pass the Delivering for America Act to provide emergency funding and put protections in place to support reliable mail delivery for all Americans.

As I said, this is serious business. The post office is important for the fabric of America.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, though this bill is going nowhere, if we defeat the previous question this morning, I will offer an amendment to take up three bills that are partnership bills that can go through the Senate to the President's desk and make a real difference for the American people, dealing with important issues like healthcare, like relief for folks suffering from the COVID economic crisis, and our law enforcement reform activities.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. BURGESS) to speak on one of those provisions.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is a sudden sense of urgency to address the financial stability of the Postal Service, but I would simply ask the body: Where was the sense of urgency from our House Democratic leadership at the start of the pandemic?

Look, I recognized in January this deal over in China was a bad deal, a novel virus, biological behavior not known, not worked out.

The Postal Service's problems did not surface this week. They have been going on for years. But the Postal Service will not go bankrupt tomorrow, and yet we have been called back here to vote on an issue that, quite frankly, is not going to get solved from today's activities.

But I called on the Committee on Energy and Commerce last February to do hearings on this novel coronavirus. My requests were ignored and then subsequently dismissed because we had other important work to do: horse racing, flavored tobacco, ticket stubs—any number of things—other than work on the novel coronavirus.

But we could have provided support in the form of funding for vaccines and testing and more. We have done some of that in the short-term sense, but we could continue to support our Nation's pandemic response in additional ways, which is why I have introduced legislation that aligns with the legislation already existing in the Senate, where we could come together and provide our country with some of the critical resources necessary to fight this novel coronavirus.

Unfortunately, the House Democratic leadership does not acknowledge or seem even to be curious as to whether or not they are up to the task.

So this legislation provides \$29 billion for the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund to develop additional medical countermeasures and vaccines. A safe and effective vaccine is the strongest arrow in our quiver to help society return to normal.

Importantly, the bill would provide \$2 billion for the Strategic National Stockpile and \$2 billion for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority for use in developing medical countermeasures.

But you have to ask yourself: The business plan as promulgated by the Speaker of this body, why is it antithetical to that development? Could it be because the nominee of their party this week in a very important speech promised the American people "no miracle is coming"? Is that because you are going to cut off the funding for BARDA? for the Strategic National Stockpile? for research on vaccines?

Look, there are commonsense, bipartisan ways to help our Nation and help our Nation respond to the coronavirus, but House Democratic leadership has turned their backs on the needs of America.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote against the previous question. Allow us to debate and pass this measure. It is of critical urgency. Indeed, a miracle could be coming.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a CNBC article, entitled, "Patients Say Post Office Slowdown Is Delaying Delivery of Life-saving Medications."

PATIENTS SAY POST OFFICE SLOWDOWN IS DELAYING DELIVERY OF LIFE-SAVING MEDICATIONS

(By Christina Farr)

The U.S. Postal Service has become a political battleground, and has experienced delays after Postmaster General Louis DeJoy slashed overtime.

Many patients are experiencing delays receiving life-saving medications and are sharing their experiences online via hashtags like #USPSMeds.

Experts say the situation could escalate, despite Postmaster General Louis DeJoy's promise to suspend changes to the Postal Service.

Nathan Geissel, who lives in rural Oregon, has been waiting more than nine days for a lifesaving medication to arrive in the mail. As far as he knows, it's stuck in a fulfillment center.

Geissel's doctor prescribed the medicine two years ago to prevent blood clots. He's never experienced delays before.

The U.S. Postal Service has become a political battleground after President Trump said he opposes additional funding because he doesn't support universal mail-in voting. Postmaster General Louis DeJoy, a Trump supporter, reportedly ordered recent cost-cutting measures, slashing overtime and curbing late delivery. It has created significant delays in mail deliveries, according to mail worker advocates and others.

Americans are sharing stories about medication delays with the hashtag #USPSMeds. Many are veterans who have reported weeks-long delays. Some are seniors who instead have to visit a pharmacy, putting them at higher risk of exposure to Covid-19.

Geissel chose mail-order for the convenience—the nearest pharmacy is 20 minutes away—and the affordability. His insurance company covers more of the cost of the medication when it's delivered by the U.S. postal service. Geissel has to pay a \$135 copay for a months supply if he instead picks it up at a retail pharmacy.

"Thankfully, a local pharmacist approved two more weeks of medication with my health plan that I could pick up as an emergency," said Geissel. "I work in health care, so I know the system, but I can't imagine what it must be like for an elderly patient who doesn't have that same access."

"I'm worried," said Liz Austin by phone. Her mother, Barbara, is sick with cystic fibrosis, a progressive disease that causes lung infections and limits her ability to breathe. "Covid-19 is primarily a respiratory disease, so my mother relies on the mail to get her prescriptions as safely as possible."

Her medicine was so late that her husband had to risk visiting a pharmacy.

After lawsuits from more than 20 state attorneys general and a call to testify before Congress, DeJoy on Tuesday said he's suspending operational changes until after the November election.

Some experts are concerned that the delays will snowball.

"There's an exponential factor to this," said John McHugh, a former congressman who heads up the Package Coalition, an alliance that aims to preserve affordable postal package delivery services. Members of the

Package Coalition include Amazon, eBay, and Cigna's Express Scripts. "Once you are behind, what happens next is you get further behind and then further behind."

The pandemic has strained the mail-order medication system as more people are apt to receive prescriptions at home. Those with pre-existing conditions are at greater risk for hospitalization if they get Covid-19.

"Data show an increase in prescription drugs dispensed through mail-service pharmacy during the pandemic," said a spokesperson from PCMA, a national association representing pharmacy benefits managers, which negotiate prescription drug costs on behalf of insurers.

Online pharmacy Honeybee Health said about 20% of patients who order delivery via first-class mail have experienced delays so far.

"The situation is fluid but it's clear from our customer service team that an usually high number of patients are receiving their medication far later than expected—and in some cases, not receiving it at all. These delays are troubling for everyone, but for patients who rely on medication to live, it's especially dangerous," said Dr. Jessica Nuhavandi, co-founder and lead pharmacist for Honeybee Health, which delivers generic medications via USPS.

Umar Afridi, founder of TruePill, a company that provides pharmacy services to telemedicine companies, said he "estimates that about 90 percent" of prescription drugs his company delivers via mail run through the postal service.

"We tend to use UPS and FedEx more for time-sensitive and expensive drugs," he said. "USPS is often the lowest cost and they have the biggest reach."

Afridi said he hasn't yet heard about delays but knows there are service-level disruptions, including pickups not happening on time.

Pharmacy benefits managers are more optimistic. Express Scripts, a major pharmacy benefit manager, said it was "not experiencing unusual delays." OptumRX (owned by UnitedHealth Group) declined to discuss delays. It said it's working with all major carriers "to help ensure timely shipments of home delivery prescriptions."

Some doctors are concerned for their low-income and elderly patients. Dr. Lakshman Swamy, a Boston-based pulmonologist and critical care doctor, says the situation could be disastrous for asthma patients who rely on Medicaid or don't have insurance. These patients might not be able to negotiate an emergency supply.

Swamy, who also has asthma, said it's common for patients with chronic respiratory conditions to rely on mail-order medications. "You can do rescue therapies for a while, but the strong medications will wear off," he said. "Once you don't get the medications you need, you can quickly fall off the wagon and end up hospitalized."

"Any additional strain will have an impact on patients," he said. "It's inevitable."

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

Madam Speaker, I don't know for certain that the Senate will take this bill up, but I fervently hope that they will, because I sure as hell know that we are doing the right thing here in the House.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to just point out, because I have heard these questions raised about the \$25 billion in this bill for the Postal Service: Why are we providing that amount?

Madam Speaker, because that is what the USPS Board of Governors recommended, and this Board is made up of 100 percent of Donald Trump's appointees. So, you know, this is not a number that Democrats made up. It is what his Republican Board of the USPS came up with. So that is why that number is there.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee that has made such a difference for so many Americans, in support of the previous question and legislation that we could bring to the floor that would make a difference to the American people.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that the Paycheck Protection Program has produced impressive results. All across America, PPP loans have supported over 50 million jobs. That is 50 million people who can continue to support themselves and their loved ones. In Ohio's First Congressional District, for example, which I have the honor of representing, the program helped over 200,000 people to stay on the payroll and support their families.

Despite this success, there are small businesses that still need our help. According to a July 27 NFIB survey, almost half of small business borrowers predict that they will need additional capital within the next 6 months.

As ranking member of the House Small Business Committee, I have pushed for targeted bipartisan solutions to make sure that our Nation's smallest firms have a chance to survive, and this Congress has acted. Now it needs to do so again to help those small businesses and their employees.

Unfortunately, the top leadership on the other side of the aisle apparently doesn't feel the urgency to do so and allow a vote on additional help for those small businesses that need it so much.

Let me be clear: Every day that goes by without action jeopardizes America's 30 million small businesses and their employees.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support reopening the Paycheck Protection Program through December 31 and allow businesses that have suffered revenue declines to apply for a second loan.

Madam Speaker, we owe it to America's small businesses to work together for a solution. We ought to be voting on that today.

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

Madam Speaker, it is interesting to hear my friend talk about the extension of PPP when he voted against that in the HEROES Act when it came before the full House. Luckily, it passed and it is over in the Senate. We are

waiting for MITCH MCCONNELL to do something.

But I love my friends on the other side of the aisle who come up with all these ideas right now. Most of them were in the HEROES Act.

But if these are so important, where is MITCH MCCONNELL? Where is the United States Senate? They went on vacation. They are gone.

We are here because we have a crisis. We have people who can't get their medications, who can't get their benefit checks. We have a crisis where we have a President who is trying to undermine our elections. So we are here doing our work.

Where is MITCH MCCONNELL? Where is the Senate? How about picking up the phone and calling them to come back and do something for the American people?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, again, if we defeat the previous question, we will bring much-needed legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a rising star here in the Republican Conference, to talk about that.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, it has been 22 days since the last time this body has met, and in those 22 days that the Speaker has refused to work on real relief packages, people have lost their jobs, small businesses have closed, and Main Streets have suffered. The American people were left with the question: Where are our leaders?

I have begged, the President has begged, and the Senate has begged: Please call the House back into session to work on a bill to help suffering Americans.

Now we are back in Washington for less than 12 hours. It is embarrassing that, while we could be working on vaccine funding, saving small businesses, and justice reform, the Speaker will gavel us out and Americans will once again be wondering: Where are our leaders?

I introduced legislation that will fund better training for police officers, increase the number of body cameras, and fund important grants to police departments that help with community policing, which builds trust and lasting relationships in the communities they serve.

It has been 89 days since George Floyd's tragic death, and in those 89 days, Senator TIM SCOTT and I have put forth legislation to fix and improve our policing. We have begged Democrat leadership to come to the table and address this issue that Americans and our communities have asked for.

Yet, what do we get? Twelve hours in Washington, D.C., and no action on vaccine funding, no action on small business relief, and no action on police reform.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question so we can consider

this important bill and get Congress back to work, because a Congress at work is America at work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman asked: Where are the leaders? We are here. We are doing our job. We are responding to a crisis.

Where is MITCH MCCONNELL? On vacation.

Where is the President? Tweeting more insults.

But we are here doing our job to help deal with this postal crisis, and we also did our job when we passed the HEROES Act.

Where is MITCH MCCONNELL? On vacation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would like to share with my friend, the chairman, that I have no further speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close when he is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

□ 1130

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

Madam Speaker, I don't know how many more times I will be on the House floor between now and the end of the year. It is a great honor I have to serve with the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts. I think all the time about all the things we could do together; and, candidly, we have done a lot of great things together. This body, when it acts together, does amazing things.

But an unfortunate thing has happened in politics these days, Madam Speaker. We talk more about the bills that we pass than the changes that we make. My friend from Massachusetts has talked time and time again about a unilaterally drafted bill passed by this House in the spring that purports to address families in need, but that included no Republican input, no partnership, had a veto message from the President, and had no chance of getting through the Senate.

We are here on exactly that same exercise today with this manufactured Postal Service bill. The Postal Service has the money that it needs. I will just tell my friends that President Trump won the mail-in vote in the great State of Georgia. That year I won the mail-in vote 2-1. There is absolutely no effort at voter suppression here. As my friend from Connecticut pointed out earlier, that is illegal. That is off the table.

We are talking about, Is there enough money to fund the Postal Service or not?

My friend from Massachusetts references a supervisor's report from the spring when they thought mail delivery was going to go down in volume. In fact, it has gone up in volume. Revenues are higher than they expected. If the Postal Service faces a revenue shortfall, I commit to my colleagues

we will be there together arm in arm to make that happen. But today, when the Postal Service is sitting on \$15 billion in cash and an unused \$10 billion line of credit, a blank check of another \$25 billion does not solve any of the challenges that you and I know exist or solve any of the problems that all of our constituents have.

Madam Speaker, the frustration you hear from my colleagues on this side of the aisle is that we are back in an emergency session working on language that is going nowhere, that will help no one. We can pound on our chests all we like about all the wonderful things that we think—unilaterally by themselves, without any bipartisan input—Democrats crafted and put in this bill. But we all know from year upon year upon year of painful experience, the only things that get done in this town get done together. In a divided government you cannot bully your way to success, Madam Speaker, you have to partner your way to success.

I know my friend from Massachusetts believes that. That is the kind of leadership style he brings to the committee on which I have the honor of serving. I understand my friends have a job to do today. They need to pass this bill. They are going to do it. It is not going to go anywhere, but they are going to do it.

Madam Speaker, defeat the previous question with me today. Let's move PPP extension, let's move vaccine funding, let's move law enforcement reform, and let's do the political exercise that you brought us here to do. But let's do these things that matter as well.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question, and if not that, defeat of the rule.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle which makes me especially sad to hear some of the comments that we heard here today.

This is a crisis that we are currently facing. We are getting calls from veterans whose medications are being delayed in the mail. We are getting calls from others whose essential benefits are being delayed in the mail. People rely on this stuff. It is important.

Madam Speaker, you have heard the testimonies that have been recounted here on our side of the aisle.

This is an emergency, and on top of that, we have a President who does not want every vote counted in the upcoming election because he believes that if we do count every vote, he will lose.

We are in the middle of a pandemic. More and more people are going to be voting by mail, and this President, rather than trying to make it easier for people to vote and to have their voices be counted, is trying to make it more difficult.

The current Postmaster General is not interested in reforming the Post

Office. He is interested in dismantling it. That is what he has been doing.

The bill that is before us is about more than money, I would say to my colleague from Georgia. It is about undoing all the damage that the current Postmaster has put into place that is resulting in all these delays, all this confusion, and all this chaos. Come on. This is serious business.

I am going to close with this. History is not going to look well on those who just went along to get along with this President while he has done some things that would have been unthinkable in any other administration, Democrat or Republican. The complicity and the indifference are shocking to me. I can't believe it sometimes when I hear people defend the indefensible.

What the President is doing with the Postal Service is indefensible, and everybody needs to be counted on this issue. I ask my Democratic colleagues and I ask my Republican colleagues to support this bill. It is the right thing to do for your constituents. Even if the man in the White House doesn't want it, it is the right thing to do. It is about time people started doing what is right for the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1092

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. 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. 8086) to provide additional appropriations for the public health and social services emergency fund, 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. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. 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 Appropriations. 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 with or without instructions. 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. 3. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 8086, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8087) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to establish a program for second draw loans and make other modifications to the paycheck protection program, 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 Small Business. 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 with or without instructions. 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. 4. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 8087, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8088) to provide funding to law enforcement agencies, 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 the Judiciary. 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 with or without instructions. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8086, H.R. 8087, and H.R. 8088.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam 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. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 171, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—230

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Beyer	F.
Allred	Bishop (GA)	Brindisi
Axne	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Bonamici	Bustos
Beatty		Butterfield

Carbajal	Horsford	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Houlahan	Peters
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Peterson
Cartwright	Huffman	Phillips
Case	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Casten (IL)	Jayapal	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Porter
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pressley
Chu, Judy	Johnson (TX)	Price (NC)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Quigley
Cisneros	Keating	Raskin
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Richmond
Clay	Khanna	Rose (NY)
Cleaver	Kildee	Rouda
Clyburn	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kim	Ruiz
Connolly	Kind	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Courtney	Lamb	Sarbanes
Cox (CA)	Langevin	Scanlon
Craig	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Crow	Lawrence	Schneider
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Schrier
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Serrano
Dean	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lipinski	Shalala
DeGette	Loeb sack	Sherman
DeLauro	Lofgren	Sherrill
DelBene	Lowenthal	Sires
Delgado	Lowe	Slotkin
Demings	Luján	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Luria	Soto
Deutch	Lynch	Spanberger
Dingell	Malinowski	Speier
Doggett	Maloney,	Stanton
Doyle, Michael F.	Carolyn B.	Stevens
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Suozzi
Escobar	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	McAdams	Takano
Españat	McBath	Thompson (CA)
Evans	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Finkenauer	McEachin	Titus
Fletcher	McGovern	Tlaib
Foster	McNerney	Tonko
Frankel	Meeks	Torres (CA)
Fudge	Meng	Torres Small
Gallego	Mfume	(NM)
Garamendi	Moore	Trahan
Garcia (IL)	Morelle	Trone
Garcia (TX)	Moulton	Underwood
Golden	Mucarsel-Powell	Vargas
Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Veasey
Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler	Vela
Gottheimer	Napolitano	Velázquez
Green, Al (TX)	Neal	Visclosky
Grijalva	Neguse	Wasserman
Haaland	Norcross	Schultz
Harder (CA)	O'Halleran	Waters
Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Hayes	Omar	Welch
Heck	Pallone	Wexton
Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Wild
Himes	Pappas	Wilson (FL)
Horn, Kendra S.	Pascrell	Yarmuth
	Payne	

NAYS—171

Abraham	Calvert	Gaetz
Allen	Carter (GA)	Gallagher
Amash	Carter (TX)	Garcia (CA)
Armstrong	Chabot	Gianforte
Arrington	Cheney	Gibbs
Babin	Cline	Gohmert
Bacon	Cloud	Gonzalez (OH)
Baird	Cole	Gooden
Balderson	Comer	Gosar
Barr	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Bergman	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Crenshaw	Green (TN)
Bilirakis	Curtis	Griffith
Bishop (NC)	Davidson (OH)	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Guest
Bost	Duncan	Guthrie
Brady	Dunn	Hagedorn
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Harris
Buchanan	Estes	Hartzler
Buck	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Fleischmann	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Fortenberry	Hill (AR)
Burgess	Fox (NC)	Hollingsworth
Byrne	Fulcher	Hudson

Huizenga	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Smucker
Jacobs	Mullin	Staubert
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (NC)	Stefanik
Johnson (SD)	Newhouse	Steil
Jordan	Norman	Stivers
Joyce (OH)	Nunes	Taylor
Joyce (PA)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Katko	Palmer	Tiffany
Keller	Pence	Tipton
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Turner
King (NY)	Posey	Upton
Kinzing	Reed	Van Drew
Kustoff (TN)	Reschenthaler	Wagner
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Walberg
LaMalfa	Riggleman	Walker
Lamborn	Roby	Walorski
Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Waltz
Lesko	Roe, David P.	Watkins
Long	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)
Loudermilk	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)
Lucas	Rooney (FL)	Wenstrup
Luetkemeyer	Rose, John W.	Westerman
Marshall	Rouzer	Williams
Massie	Rutherford	Wilson (SC)
Mast	Scalise	Wittman
McCarthy	Schweikert	Womack
McCaul	Scott, Austin	Woodall
McClintock	Sensenbrenner	Wright
McKinley	Simpson	Yoho
Miller	Smith (MO)	Young
Mitchell	Smith (NE)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt	Granger	Olson
Amodel	Graves (GA)	Roy
Banks	Higgins (LA)	Shimkus
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Spano
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Steube
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Timmons
Flores	McHenry	Walden
Gabbard	Meuser	

□ 1235

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Huffman (Kildee)	Peters (Rice)
Barragán (Beyer)	Jayapal (Raskin)	(NY)
Bera (Aguilar)	Johnson (TX)	Peterson (Vela)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	(Jeffries)	Pingree (Clark)
Bonamici (Raskin)	Kennedy (Deutch)	(MA)
Brownley (CA)	Khanna (Gomez)	Porter (Wexton)
(Clark (MA))	Kind (Beyer)	Price (NC)
Cárdenas (Gallego)	Kirkpatrick	(Butterfield)
(Gomez)	(Gallgo)	Rooney (FL)
Case	Kuster (NH)	(Beyer)
(Cartwright)	(Clark (MA))	Roybal-Allard
Clay (Davids)	Lawson (FL)	(McCollum)
(KS)	(Evans)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Costa (Cooper)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Rush
Davis (CA) (Wild)	Lipinski (Cooper)	(Underwood)
DeGette (Blunt)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Sánchez
Rochester)	Lowenthal	(Aguilar)
DelBene (Heck)	(Beyer)	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Lowe (Tonko)	(Kelly (IL))
(Matsui)	McNerney	Schneider
Doggett (Raskin)	(Raskin)	(Houlahan)
Engel (Pallone)	Meng (Clark)	Serrano
Escobar (Garcia)	(MA)	(Jeffries)
(TX)	Moore (Beyer)	Sires (Pallone)
Foster (Beyer)	Mucarsel-Powell	Speier (Scanlon)
Frankel (Clark)	(Wasserman)	Thompson (CA)
(MA)	Schultz)	(Kildee)
Garamendi	Nadler (Jeffries)	Titus (Connolly)
(Sherman)	Napolitano	Visclosky
Gonzalez (TX)	(Correa)	(Raskin)
(Gomez)	Omar (Pressley)	Watson Coleman
Grijalva (Garcia)	Panetta (Kildee)	(Pallone)
(IL)	Pascrell	Welch
Hastings	(Pallone)	(McGovern)
(Wasserman)	Payne	Wilson (FL)
Schultz)	(Wasserman)	(Hayes)
Horsford (Kildee)	Schultz)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 171, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—171

Abraham	Babin	Bergman
Allen	Bacon	Biggs
Amash	Baird	Bilirakis
Armstrong	Balderson	Bishop (NC)
Arrington	Barr	Bishop (UT)

Bost	Hagedorn	Reed
Brady	Harris	Reschenthaler
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Budd	Hill (AR)	Roe, David P.
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Huizenga	Rooney (FL)
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Rose, John W.
Carter (GA)	Jacobs	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cheney	Jordan	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Katko	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Keller	Simpson
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	King (NY)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Kinzing	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Curtis	LaHood	Staubert
Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Steil
DesJarlais	Latta	Stivers
Duncan	Lesko	Taylor
Dunn	Long	Thompson (PA)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Estes	Lucas	Tipton
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Upton
Fleischmann	Massie	Van Drew
Fortenberry	Mast	Wagner
Foxx (NC)	McCarthy	Walberg
Fulcher	McCauley	Walker
Gaetz	McClintock	Walorski
Gallagher	McKinley	Waltz
Garcia (CA)	Miller	Watkins
Gianforte	Mitchell	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin	Westerman
Gooden	Murphy (NC)	Williams
Gosar	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Graves (LA)	Norman	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Womack
Green (TN)	Palazzo	Woodall
Griffith	Palmer	Wright
Grothman	Pence	Yoho
Guest	Perry	Young
Guthrie	Posey	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amodei	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Banks	Holding	Shimkus
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Spano
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Steube
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Thornberry
Flores	Marchant	Timmons
Gabbard	McHenry	Walden
Granger	Meuser	

□ 1317

Mrs. MILLER and Mr. VAN DREW changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	DeBene (Heck)	Horsford (Kildee)
Barragán (Beyer)	DeSaulnier	Huffman (Kildee)
Bera (Aguilar)	(Matsui)	Jayapal (Raskin)
Blumenauer	Doggett (Raskin)	Johnson (TX)
(Beyer)	Engel (Pallone)	(Jeffries)
Bonamici	Escobar (Garcia)	Kennedy
(Raskin)	(TX)	(Deutch)
Brownley (CA)	Foster (Beyer)	Khanna (Gomez)
(Clark (MA))	Frankel (Clark)	Kind (Beyer)
Cárdenas	(MA))	Kirkpatrick
(Gomez)	Garamendi	(Gallego)
Case	(Sherman)	Kuster (NH)
(Cartwright)	Gonzalez (TX)	(Clark (MA))
Clay (Davids	(Gomez)	Lawson (FL)
(KS))	Grijalva (Garcia	(Evans)
Costa (Cooper)	(IL))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	Hastings	Lipinski (Cooper)
DeGette (Blunt	(Wasserman	Lofgren (Jeffries)
Rochester)	Schultz)	

Lowenthal	Payne	Sánchez
(Beyer)	(Wasserman	(Aguilar)
Lowey (Tonko)	Schultz)	Schakowsky
McNerney	Peters (Rice	(Kelly (IL))
(Raskin)	(NY))	Schneider
Meng (Clark	Peterson (Vela)	(Houlahan)
(MA))	Pingree (Clark	Serrano
Moore (Beyer)	(MA))	(Jeffries)
Mucarsel-Powell	Porter (Wexton)	Sires (Pallone)
(Wasserman	Price (NC)	Speier (Scanlon)
Schultz)	(Butterfield)	Thompson (CA)
Nadler (Jeffries)	Rooney (FL)	(Kildee)
Napolitano	(Beyer)	Titus (Connolly)
(Correa)	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Omar (Pressley)	(McCollum)	(Raskin)
Panetta (Kildee)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Rush	(Pallone)
(Pallone)	(Underwood)	Welch
		(McGovern)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1334

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Pub. L. 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Mr. Arien Malec, Oakland, California

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 21, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, pursuant to 42 USC Sec. 300jj-12, I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Ms. Cynthia A. Fisher, Newton, Massachusetts

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1092, I call up the bill (H.R.