our economy, our global competitiveness, and the incentive to invest in American workers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and to prevent dangerous disruptions to our economy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this amendment seeks to hinder workers' First Amendment right to assemble peacefully to better their workplace situation.

No worker wants to go on strike. No worker wants to forgo a paycheck so they can walk a picket line, often in the frigid cold of winter or in the burning sun in the summer. Workers strike because they are left with no other option.

The right to withhold labor is a core right, supposedly protected in our labor law, and the PRO Act would restore that fundamental right because, in practice, it has been gutted.

I actually agree with the gentleman that what we need is to restore the balance that the National Labor Relations Act sought to create when it was passed in 1935.

The things we are changing aren't the National Labor Relations Act that was passed. It is not that balance. It is the ways that employees' freedom to withhold their labor has been gutted in the interim by State and Federal courts and by this body.

We need to restore workers' freedom to withhold their labor in order to improve their situation. That is all this bill does. Let's get back to that balance.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the right to organize is appropriately protected in America, the right to organize fairly, honestly, and transparently.

My amendment would provide greater fairness and transparency by prohibiting so-called neutrality agreements. These prevent an employer from saying anything negative about the union and ensure that workers only hear one side, the union boss's side.

Neutrality agreements often include card check in lieu of a secret ballot, permit unions access to company property for organizational efforts, and give private employee contact information to the unions. The company, which was inevitably threatened with retaliatory consequences if they didn't agree to the neutrality agreement, will often provide the unions with a captive audience on company time to present the prounion argument.

Neutrality agreements are grounded in the same leftist view that companies are trying to take advantage of their employees. Neutrality agreements should be prohibited. Employees should be permitted to hear both sides, pro and con, regarding organizing, and then permitted to make informed decisions by secret ballot.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this amendment is truly amazing to me as a longtime union organizer. It seeks to undermine the freedom of contract, the ability of employers and unions to agree on how to handle a situation freely together.

The shock of giving the employees' addresses and other contact information: That is required in every NLRB election, and it has been since the Excelsior Underwear case many decades ago.

The shock of letting the workers have access to hearing from the union on company time: The current law is that employers can force employees, on company time, to listen to antiunion propaganda the entire time. If you refuse to go, you could be fired. But if an organizer tries to step on the premises of the employer, they could be arrested.

I have been arrested for trying to talk to workers. It was on a public sidewalk, but the police said we were too close. Anyway, that was thrown out, as it should have been. We were exercising our First Amendment rights.

In any event, this amendment is truly astounding in a capitalist society. We need to let parties be free, and I urge rejection of the amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman so much for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, at base, what we are talking about here is whether workers in this country are free to come together and form a union. All of these amendments are designed to undermine that right.

Let's get back to the basic concept of a free market for workers, where they, prounion or antiunion, can decide amongst themselves whether they want to form a union or not, and not have the person in the world who has the most power over them, their boss, who decides their wages and their hours, to pressure them, to force them to listen to things, to subject them to propaganda.

The PRO Act simply creates freedom for workers to form unions, at long last, so that the workers who want to form a union can do so freely.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues for offering these thoughtful amendments, which would protect the interests and rights of workers and employers alike. They negate some of the worst aspects of the PRO Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that the PRO Act gives workers the right to form a union. That right has been around since the 1930s, Madam Speaker. Workers are already free to form a union, and Republicans do nothing to try to stop that freedom.

What the underlying bill does, however, is take away the freedom not to belong to a union. That is a fundamental freedom in this country, and we ought not to be taking that away from the American workers.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Republican en bloc amendments and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, as a group, these amendments would erode workers' rights, slow down elections, allow workers to freeload, or even prohibit employers from agreeing not to interfere with the election. I would hope that we would defeat these amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 842 is postponed.

□ 1500

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1319, AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117–11) on the resolution (H. Res. 198) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1319, AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). 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 distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 198, providing for a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

The rule provides 2 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Budget and Ways and Means.

Madam Speaker, a once-in-a-century pandemic brought us the need to act, and a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President have seized the moment, not as a chance to help big corporations or the already well-off, as those on the other side have done over and over again, but as an opportunity to invest in our workers, our students, our communities, and the very people who need help the most.

More than 18 million Americans are receiving unemployment benefits today. Nearly 24 million adults are going hungry. Roughly 12 million children are living in households with food insecurity. Up to 40 million people cannot afford to pay rent and fear eviction. Over 2 million women have been forced to leave the workforce. Eight of 10 minority businesses are on the brink of closure. That is what COVID has wrought in America today.

This is more than a Band-Aid; this is a lifeline, Madam Speaker. It will put more vaccines in arms, put more kids back safely in schools, put more money in people's pockets, and put more people back to work. It is hard to overstate just how important this is.

This bill, Madam Speaker, attacks inequality and poverty in ways we haven't seen in a generation. This legislation makes the biggest investments in our workers and our middle class that I have seen in my two-and-a-half decades of service here.

Make no mistake, I am disappointed to see the cut in the unemployment insurance made over in the Senate, and we are going to keep fighting to raise the minimum wage so that no one who works full time lives in poverty. We are going to keep focusing on the hunger crisis in this country until we end it once and for all. These should be fundamental priorities of the wealthiest nation on the planet.

But let's be clear. Today, we are on the doorstep of history. We are about to send the most sweeping and progressive economic investment in modern times to the President of the United States: $1,400 in direct payments, a historic child allowance, school infrastructure, an expansion of the Affordable Care Act, student loan relief, billions in rental assistance, aid that will cut child poverty in half, and I could go on and on and on.

Everything included in this final package is necessary to crush the virus and revitalize our economy.

As I have noted, I have been in Congress for more than 20 years, but this, Madam Speaker, this is among my proudest moments.

I want to thank our distinguished Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and my fellow committee chairs who worked so hard on this bill. I want to thank Budget Committee Chair YARMUTH and all of my colleagues here in the House for getting us to this point.

Democrats on both sides of the Capitol, together with the Biden administration, have crafted something historic. In 1 day, with a single vote in favor of this bill, we will change the lives of millions of Americans for the better.

For all of our important work, day in and day out, we don't get many chances like this. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this rule and the underlying rescue plan.

Let us rise and meet this moment, and let's send this historic bill to the President's desk for his signature.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

First, the House considered the budget resolution setting the budget reconciliation instructions for this massive coronavirus relief bill. Then, the House considered and passed, on a partisan basis, the budget resolution authorizing a deficit increase of nearly $2 trillion. After an all-night vote-a-rama in the Senate, the House will consider this package for the third time.

Three times the House will have debated and passed a partisan package, and only 9 percent is dedicated to actually crushing the coronavirus. This isn't just disappointing; it is irresponsible, and it is unrepresentative of the American people.

Currently, Democrats only hold the majority by five Representatives. That means that the 211 Republicans, representing nearly 150 million Americans, have been shut out of this process; 150 million Americans are not represented in the package before us today.

Madam Speaker, we all want to provide the resources to successfully emerge on the other side of the pandemic. This bill does include funding for testing and vaccine deployment, as well as some economic support and aid to those who are unemployed or experiencing food shortages, but this support is not targeted toward those identified as most vulnerable.

This bill includes $1,400 in economic stimulus payments to anyone making $75,000 a year or less, including those who may not have lost their jobs or experienced reduced employment. In addition, there is no mechanism to ensure that these payments go only to American citizens.

Republicans were pleased that the infrastructure projects in California and New York, projects that had nothing to do with coronavirus relief, have been removed. We are glad of that.

My Democratic colleagues may argue that these projects would have created jobs, but why then are Democrats also providing $125 billion to schools even if they remain closed? Teachers want to teach. Teachers want to be safely in their classrooms teaching. The Centers for Disease Control has confirmed that with appropriate safety precautions, the risk of coronavirus transmission in schools is minimal. In fact, many States are prioritizing teachers for vaccines. Madam Speaker, our State of Texas is doing so. Why are we paying schools to keep them home?

This bill also provides $362 billion for State and local governments. The CARES Act, passed on March 27, already provided a $150 billion Coronavirus Relief Fund to help local entities with lost revenue during the shutdowns. However, many local authorities have chosen to keep their economies shut down, despite a drop in coronavirus cases and the effectiveness of safety measures like social distancing and mask-wearing.